

BAPTISM

AND THE

Lord's Supper.

Substantially Asserted.

BEING AN

APOLOGY

In Behalf of the People called

QUAKERS,

Concerning those *Two Heads*.

By ROBERT BARCLAY.

L O N D O N.

Printed, and Sold by T. Sowle, in *White-
Hart-Court* in *Gracious-Street*. 1696.

10585

5016 2

BTR

H

H

wi
ing
vin
&ti
T
tij
an
th
cer

TO THE
READER.

Friendly Reader,

HAVING often observed,
upon serious Discourse
with divers Persons, concern-
ing our Principles, their ha-
ving received general satisfa-
ction, excepting in these
Two Heads, *viz.* *Bap-
tism* and the *Lord's Supper*,
and not knowing but that
tho' ^{you} may be at a stand con-
cerning the same, I do here

10585

5016 2

BTR

R

I

wi
in
vi
at
T
ti
an
th
ce

TO THE
READER.

Friendly Reader,

HAVING often observed,
upon serious Discourse
with divers Persons, concern-
ing our Principles, their ha-
ving received general satisfa-
ction, excepting in these
Two Heads, *viz.* *Bap-*
tism and the *Lord's Supper*,
and not knowing but that
tho' may be at a stand con-
cerning the same, I do here

To the Reader.

present thee for thy further information and satisfaction these following Sheets, written and published several Years ago, upon the same Subjects, by my Father *Robert Barclay*, in his *Apology* Dedicated to King *Charles* the Second.

The second and more particular reason of their being thus published by themselves, is, that being Bound up in a pretty large Book, they may not be of such general Service, in regard that some dissatisfied only concerning these Two Points, may not much care to Buy the whole. Be-

To the Reader:

Being fully satisfied his aim in Penning them, was for thy satisfaction, I shall commend them no otherways, than by recommending them to thy serious perusal, not doubting if they be by thee received in the same *Spirit of Love*, they were for thy sake designed, they may prove advantageous.

I do likewise advise thee seriously to consider, what woful consequence have been procured in the *Titular Christian World*, since the first Apostacy after the Apostles Days, about these things, and

To the Reader.

and the setting up of Forms and Ceremonies in the *Church* in Matters purely *Religious*, and relying thereupon, as there are too many in these Days do, who by grasping at the shadow do lose the substance. I pray God open the Eyes, and enlighten the Understandings of such, that seeing the emptiness and insufficiency, as well as folly thereof, they may with their whole *Hearts* and *Souls* lay hold upon him who is able to save, and that to the *uttermost*.

To the Reader.

I would have none offend-
ed that I call those Ceremo-
nies, which they may think
Essential Duties, without their
being first assured they are
such.

Although I refer thee to
the following Sheets for thy
more particular Information,
yet it may not seem imperti-
nent to put thee in mind of
that saying of *John the Bap-
tist* concerning himself, *I in-
deed baptize you with Water
unto Repentance, but he that
cometh after me, is mightier
than I, he shall baptize you
with the Holy Ghost, and with*

To the Reader.

Fire, Mat. 3. 11. also HE must Increase but I must Decrease, John 3. 30. likewise that of Paul to the Ephesians, where he notably argues, as there is but one Lord, one Faith, so there is but one Baptism, Eph. 4. 5. which the Apostle Peter positively asserts is not the washing away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good Conscience towards God, 1 Pet. 3. 21. These I leave without Commentary, to thy impartial perusal.

It were greatly to be wished for, that we who covet to be called by that Honourable
Name

To the Reader.

Name of *Christian*, were more inward, less in show, more in *Substance*, that our *Christianity* were more in our *Hearts*, and less in our *Heads*; then would our *Religion* be pure and undefiled, carrying along with it that Characteristick mark, of *visiting* the *Widow* and the *Fatherless*, and keeping our selves *unspotted* from the *World*; this is the Description the *Apostle James* in his *Day* gave of *True Religion*, *James* 1. 27. this is likewise the Path the *True Christian* ought now to walk in, it being only as we here abide

To the Reader.

abide, that we can stand approved, in the sight of our Great *Creator*, in which, Reader, as thou art found a Walker, with a single Heart and Eye unto God, thou wilt know an eating of the *Flesh*, and drinking of the *Blood* of the Son of God, by which thou vvilt know *Life*, unto thy *Soul*, according to that saying of our *Lord* and *Saviour Jesus Christ*, *Except ye eat the Flesh, and drink the Blood of the Son of Man, there is no Life in you*; for saith he, *my Flesh is Meat indeed, and my Blood is Drink indeed,*
John

To the Reader.

John 6. 53. 55. This Food is **I**nward, it is **S**piritual, to the Nourishment of the inner Man, not perceptible to the outvvard Notions of Carnal-minded Men; this is the true *Supper* of vvhich the Saints do feed, vvhereby they are *re-freshed*, to the comforting of their Immortal Souls, being the same vvvhich the Saints in all Ages vv ere partakers of: Which that thou may come to knowv, and be made partaker of, by *Waiting* for, and being Obedient unto the Appearance of his *Grace, Light, Spirit, or Word* of Life in thy
own

To the Reader.

ovyn Soul, (that being the
only Way) is the Desire
of thy Sincere Friend,

Robert Barclay.

London, the 12th.
of the 8th. Month,
1695.

CON-

CONCERNING BAPTISM.

As there is one Lord, *and* one Faith, so there is one Baptism; which is not the putting away the *flesh* of the *flesh*, but the *Answer* of a good Conscience before God, by the Resurrection of Jesus Christ. *And this Baptism is a Pure and Spiritual thing, to wit, the Baptism of the Spirit and Fire, by which we are buried with him; that being washed and purged from our Sins, we may walk in newness of Life: Of which the Baptism of John was a Figure, which was Com- manded for a time, and not to continue for ever. As to the Baptism of Infants, it is a meer Humane Tradition, for which neither Precept nor Practice is to be found in all the Scripture.*

Eph. 4. 5.

1 Pet. 3.

21.

Rom. 6. 4.

Gal. 3. 27.

Col. 2. 12.

John 3. 30.

1 Cor. 1.

17.

WHen God in Condescension to his chosen people, the Jews, did prescribe to them by his Servant Moses

From

whence I

deducted

and A. 2.

then- Su-

p. 11. 11. 11.

many did spring.

Concerning Baptism.

many *Ceremonies* and *Observations*, as *Types* and *Shadows* of the *Substance*, which in due time was to be *Revealed*; which consisted for the most part in *Washings*, outward *Purifications* and *Cleanings*, which were to continue, until the *Time* of the *Reformation*, until the *Spiritual Worship* should be set up, and that God by the more powerful *pouring forth* of his *Spirit*, and guiding of that *Anointing*, should lead his *Children into all Truth*, and teach them to *Worship* him in a way more *Spiritual* and acceptable to him, though less agreeable to the *Carnal* and *Outward Senses*. Yet notwithstanding *God's Condescension* to the *Jews* in such things, we see, that that part in man, which delights to follow its own *Inventions*, could not be restrained, nor yet satisfied with all these *Observations*; but that often-times they would be either *declining* to the other *Superstitions* of the *Gentiles*, or *adding* some *New Observations* and *Ceremonies* of their own: To which they were so devoted, that they were still apt to *prefer them* before the *Command* of God, and that under the *Notion* of *Zeal* and *Piety*. This we see abundantly in the *Example* of the *Pharisees*, the *Chiefest Sect* among the *Jews*, whom Christ so frequently reproves for

making

The Pharisees the Chiefest Sect among the Jews.

making void the Commandments of God by their Traditions, Matth. 15. 6, 9, &c.

This Complaint may at this day be no less justly made, as to many bearing the Name of *Christians*, who have introduced many things of this kind, partly borrowed from the *Jews*, which they more tenaciously stick to, and more earnestly contend for, than for the weightier Points of *Christianity*; because that Self yet alive and ruling in them, loves their own *Inventions* better, than *God's Commands*. But if they can by any means stretch any *Scripture-practice*, or *Conditional precept* or *permission*, fitted to the *Weakness* or *Capacity* of some, or appropriate to some particular *Dispensation*, to give some Colour for any of these their *Inventions*, they do then so tenaciously stick to them, and so obstinately and obstreperously plead for them, that they will not patiently hear the *most-solid Christian Reasons* against them. Which Zeal, if they would but seriously Examine it, they would find to be but the *prejudice* of *Education*, and the *Love* of *Self*, more than of *God*, or his *Pure Worship*. This is verified concerning those things, which are called *Sacraments*; about which they are very ignorant in *Religious Controversies*, who understand not, how much De-
Many things in Christendom are borrow'd from the Jews and Gentiles.
Of Sacraments so many Controversies.
 bate,

bate, Contention, Jangling and Quarrelling there has been among those called *Christians*: So that I may safely say, the *Controversie* about them, to wit, about their *Number, Nature, Vertue, Efficacy, Administration* and other things, hath been more than about any other *Doctrine of Christ*, whether as betwixt *Papists* and *Protestants*, or among *Protestants* betwixt themselves. And how great *prejudice* these *Controversies* have brought to *Christians*, is very obvious; whereas the things contended for among them, are for the most part but *Empty Shadows*, and meer *Out-side* things: as I hope hereafter to make appear to the patient and unprejudicate *Reader*.

The Name
of Sacra-
ment (not
found in
Scripture)
is borrow'd
from the
Heathens.

§ II. That which comes first under Observation, is the Name [*Sacrament*] which is strange, that *Christians* should stick to, and *Contend* so much for, since it is not to be found in all the *Scripture*; but was borrowed from the *Military Oaths* among the *Heathens*, from whom the *Christians*, when they began to *Apostatize*, did borrow many *superstitious Terms* and *Observations*, that they might thereby *Ingratiate* themselves, and the more easily gain the *Heathens* to their *Religion*: which practice, though perhaps intended by them for good, yet, as being the fruit of *Humane Policy*,

licy, and not according to God's Wisdom, has had very pernicious Consequences. I see not, how any, whether Papists or Protestants, especially the latter, can in reason quarrel with us for denying this Term, which it seems the Spirit of God saw not meet to inspire the Pen-men of the Scriptures to leave unto us.

But if it be said, That it is not the Name, Obj. 1: but the Thing, they contend for :

I Answer : Let the Name then, as not being Scriptural, be laid aside, and we shall see at first Entrance, how much Benefit will redound by laying aside this Traditional Term, and betaking us to plainness of Scripture-Language. For presently the great Contest about the Number of them will evanish ; seeing there is no Term used in Scripture, that can be made use of, whether we call them Institutions, Ordinances, Precepts, Commandments, Appointments or Laws, &c. that would afford ground for such a Debate ; since neither Papists will affirm, that there are only Seven, or Protestants only Two, of any of these forementioned.

If it be said, That this Controversie arises from the Definition of the Thing, as well as from the Name ;

It will be found otherwise : For what

The *Definition* of *Sacraments* agrees to many other things.

What *Sealing Ordinance* doth mean?

Obj. 3.

Ans.

ever way we take their *Definition* of a *Sacrament*, whether as an *outward, visible Sign, whereby inward Grace is conferred, or only signified*: This *Definition* will agree to many things, which neither *Papists* nor *Protestants* will acknowledge to be *Sacraments*. If they be expressed under the Name of *Sealing Ordinances*, as some do, I could never see, neither by *Reason* nor *Scripture*, how this *Title* could be appropriate to them, more than to any other *Christian, Religious Performance*: for that must needs properly be a *Sealing Ordinance*, which makes the *Persons* receiving it *infal- libly certain* of the *Promise*, or *Thing sealed* to them.

If it be said, *It is so to them, that are faithful.*

I Answer: So is *Praying* and *Preaching*, and doing of every good *Work*: Seeing the *Partaking* or *Performing* of the one gives not to any a *more certain Title* to *Heaven*, yea (in some respect) not so much; there is no *Reason* to call them so, more than the other.

Besides, we find not any thing called the *Seal* and *Pledge* of our *Inheritance*, but the *Spirit of God*; it is by that we are said to be *sealed*, Eph. i. 14. & 4. 30. which is also termed the *Earnest* of our *Inheritance*,

tance, 2 Cor. i. 22. and not by outward Water, or Eating and Drinking; which as the Wickedest of Men may partake of, so many that do, do notwithstanding it, go to Perdition. For it is not outward Washing with Water, that maketh the Heart clean, by which Men are fitted for Heaven: And as that which goeth into the mouth, doth not defile a Man, because it is put forth again, and so goeth to the Dung-hill; neither doth any thing which Man eateth, purifie him, or fit him for Heaven. What is said here in general, may serve for an Introduction, not only to this Proposition, but also to the other concerning the Supper. *Of the Sacraments* (so called). Baptism is always first numbered, which is the Subject of the present Proposition; in whose Explanation I shall first demonstrate and prove Our Judgment; and then Answer the Objections, and Refute the Sentiments of our Opposers. As to the first part, these things following, Part I. which are briefly comprehended in the Proposition, come to be proposed and proved.

That outward Washing doth not cleanse the Heart.

§ III. First: That there is but One Baptism, as well as but One Lord, One Faith, &c.

Secondly, That this one Baptism, which is the Baptism of Christ, is not a washing with,

with, or dipping in Water, but a being baptized by the Spirit.

III. *Thirdly: That the Baptism of John was but a Figure of this, and therefore, as the Figure, to give place to the Substance; which though it be to continue, yet the other is ceased.*

Prop. I. *As for the first, viz. That there is but one Baptism, there needs no other Proof, than the Words of the Text, Eph. 4. 5. One Lord, one Faith, one Baptism; where the Apostle positively and plainly affirms, that as there is but One Body, One Spirit, One Faith, One God, &c. so there is but One Baptism.*

Obj. I. *As to what is commonly alledged by way of Explanation upon the Text, That the Baptism of Water and of the Spirit make up this One Baptism by vertue of this Sacramental Union.*

Ans. I Answer; This Exposition hath taken place, not because grounded upon the Testimony of the Scripture, but because it wrests the Scripture, to make it suit to their Principle of Water-Baptism: and so there needs no other Reply, but to deny it, as being repugnant to the plain words of the Text, which saith not, That there are Two Baptisms, to wit, one of Water, the other of the Spirit, which do make up the
One

Whether
Two Baptisms
do
make up
the One?

One Baptism; but plainly, that *there is One Baptism*, as there is *One Faith* and *One God*. Now there goeth not *Two Faiths*, nor *Two Gods*, nor *Two Spirits*, nor *Two Bodies*, whereof the one is *Outward* and *Elementary*, and the other *Spiritual* and *Pure*, to the making up of the *One Faith*, the *One God*, the *One Body*, and the *One Spirit*; so neither ought there to go *Two Baptisms* to make up the *One Baptism*.

But *Secondly*: If it be said, *The Baptism* Obj. 2. *is but One*, whereof *Water* is the one part, to wit, the *Sign*; and the *Spirit*, the thing signified, the other.

I *Answer*: This yet more confirmeth *Answer*. our *Doctrine*: For if *Water* be only the *Sign*, it is not the *Matter* of the *One Baptism* (as shall further hereafter by its *Definition* in *Scripture* appear) and we are to take the *One Baptism* for the *Matter* of it, not for the *Sign*, or *Figure* and *Type* that went before. Even as where *Christ* is called the *One Offering* in *Scripture*, though he was *Typified* by many *Sacrifices* and *Offerings* under the *Law*, we understand only by the *One Offering* his *Offering* himself upon the *Cross*: whereof though those many *Offerings* were *Signs* and *Types*; yet we say not, that they go together with that *Offering* of *Christ*, to make up the *One Offering*.
 If *Water* be the *Type*, the *Substance* must remain.

fering: So neither though *Water-Baptism* was a *Sign* of *Christ's Baptism*, will it follow, that it goeth now to make up the *Baptism* of *Christ*. If any should be so *Ab-surd*, as to affirm, *That this One Baptism here, were the Baptism of Water, and not of the Spirit*: That were foolishly to contradict the positive *Testimony* of the *Scripture*, which saith the contrary; as by what followeth will more amply appear.

Prop. II. Secondly: *That this One Baptism, which*
 Proof I. *is the Baptism of Christ, is not a Washing with Water, appears first, from the Testimony of John, the proper and peculiar Administrator of Water-Baptism, Matt. 3. 11. I indeed baptize you with Water unto Repentance; but he that cometh after me, is mightier than I, whose shoes I am not worthy to bear: he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost, and with Fire.* Here *John* mentions two manners of Baptisings, and two different Baptisms, the one with *Water*, and the other with the *Spirit*; the one whereof he was the Minister of, the other whereof *Christ* was the Minister of: and such as were baptized with the first, were not therefore baptized with the second: *I indeed baptize you, but he shall baptize you.* Though in the present time they were baptized with the *Baptism* of *Water*; yet they were not

They that
 had *John's*
Baptism,
 had not
 therefore
Christ's.

as yet, but were to be baptized with the Baptism of Christ. From all which I thus Argue,

If those that were baptized with the Baptism of Water, were not therefore baptized with the Baptism of Christ; then the Baptism of Water is not the Baptism of Christ. Arg. 1.

But the first is true :

Therefore also the last.

And again,

If he, that truly and really administred the Baptism of Water, did notwithstanding declare, That he neither could, nor did baptize with the Baptism of Christ; Then the Baptism of Water is not the Baptism of Christ. Arg. 2.

But the first is true :

Therefore, &c.

And indeed to understand it otherwise, would make John's Words void of good sense: For if their Baptisms had been all one, why should he have so precisely Contradistinguished them? Why should he have said, that those whom he had already baptized, should yet be baptized by another Baptism?

If it be urged, That Baptism with Water Object. was the one part, and that with the Spirit the other part, or Effect only of the former.

Answ.
One Baptism is no Part nor Effect of the other.

I Answer: This *Exposition* contradicts the plain words of the *Text*. For he saith not, *I baptize you with Water*; and he, that cometh after, shall produce the Effects of this my Baptism in you by the Spirit, &c. or he shall accomplish this Baptism in you; but he shall Baptize you. So then, if we understand the Word truly and properly, when he saith, *I Baptize you*, as consenting, that thereby is really signified, that he did baptize with the Baptism of Water; we must needs, unless we offer Violence to the *Text*, understand the other part of the sentence the same way; that where he adds presently, *But he shall baptize you*, &c. that he understood it of their being truly to be baptized with another Baptism, than what he did baptize with: Else it had been Non-sense for him thus to have Contradistinguished them.

Proof II.
Who were baptized by John, were still to wait for Christ's Baptism with the Spirit.

Secondly: This is further confirmed by the Saying of Christ himself, *Acts 1. 4, 5.* But wait for the promise of the Father, which (saith he) ye have heard of me: For John truly baptized with Water, but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many days hence. There can scarce Two places of Scripture run more parallel, than this doth with the former a little before mentioned, and therefore concludeth the same way,

as did the other. For Christ there grants fully, that *John* compleated his *Baptism*, as to the *matter* and *substance* of it: *John* saith he, *truly baptized with Water*; which is as much as if he had said, *John did truly and fully Administer the Baptism of Water*; But ye shall be *Baptized with*, &c. This sheweth, that they were to be *Baptized* with some other *Baptism*, than the *Baptism of Water*; and that, although they were formerly *Baptized* with the *Baptism of Water*, yet not with that of *Christ*, which they were to be *Baptized* with.

Thirdly; *Peter* observes the same distinction, *Acts* 11. 16. Then remembered I the word of the Lord, how that he said, *John indeed Baptized with Water*; but ye shall be *Baptized with the Holy Ghost*. The Apostle makes this Application upon the *Holy Ghost's* falling upon them; whence he infers, that they were then *Baptized* with the *Baptism of the Spirit*: As to what is urged from his *Calling* afterwards for *Water*, to it shall be hereafter spoken. From all which *Three Sentences* relative one to another, *First* of *John*, *Secondly* of *Christ*, and *Thirdly* of *Peter*, it doth evidently follow, that such as were truly and really *Baptized* with the *Baptism of Water*, were notwithstanding not *Baptized* with the

Proof
III.
The Baptism with the Holy Ghost, and that with Water, differ.

Bap-

Baptism of the Spirit; which is that of *Christ*: and such as truly and really did administer the *Baptism of Water*, did in so doing, not administer the *Baptism of Christ*. So that, if there be now but *One Baptism*, as we have already proved, we may safely conclude, that it is that of the *Spirit*, and not of *Water*; else it would follow, that *the One Baptism*, which now continues, were the *Baptism of Water*, i. e. *John's Baptism*, and not the *Baptism of the Spirit*, i. e. *Christ's*, which were most Absurd.

Object.

If it be said further, That though the *Baptism of John*, before *Christ's* was administered, was different from it, as being the *Figure only*; yet now that both it as the *Figure*, and that of the *Spirit* as the *Substance*, is necessary to make up the *One Baptism*.

Ans.

I Answer: This urgeth nothing, unless it be granted also, that both of them belong to the *Essence of Baptism*; so that *Baptism* is not to be accounted as truly Administred, where both are not: which none of our *Adversaries* will acknowledge; but on the contrary account not only all those truly Baptized with the *Baptism of Christ*, who are Baptized with *Water*, though they be uncertain whether they be Baptized with the *Spirit*, or not; but they even account such

Water Baptism is not the true Baptism of Christ.

such truly Baptized with the Baptism of Christ, becaule Sprinkled, or Baptized with Water, though it be manifest and most certain, that they are not Baptized with the Spirit, as being Enemies thereunto in their Hearts by wicked Works. So here, by their own Confession, Baptism with Water is without the Spirit: Wherefore we may far safer conclude, that the Baptism of the Spirit, which is that of Christ, is and may be without that of Water; as appears in that Acts 11. where Peter testifies of these Men, that they were Baptized with the Spirit, though not then Baptized with Water. And indeed, the Controversie in this, as in most other things, stands betwixt us and our Opposers, in that they not only oftentimes prefer the Form and Shadow to the Power and Substance, by denominating persons, as Inheritors and Possessors of the thing, from their having the Form and Shadow, though really wanting the Power and Substance; and not admitting those to be so denominated, who have the Power and Substance, if they want the Form and Shadow. This appears evidently, in that they account those truly Baptized with the One Baptism of Christ, who are not baptized with the Spirit (which in Scripture is particularly called the Baptism of Christ)

The Baptism of the Spirit needeth no Sprinkling or Dipping in Water.

if they be only *baptized* with *Water*; which themselves yet Confess to be but the *Shadow*, or *Figure*. And moreover, in that they account not those, who are surely *baptized* with the *Baptism* of the *Spirit*, *baptized*, neither will they have them so denominate, unless they be also *Sprinkled* with, or *Dipped* in *Water*: But we on the Contrary, do always prefer the *Power* to the *Form*, the *Substance* to the *Shadow*; and where the *Substance* and *Power* is, we doubt not to denominate the *Person* accordingly, though the *Form* be wanting. And therefore we always seek first and plead for the *Substance* and *Power*, as knowing that to be *indispensibly necessary*; though the *Form* sometimes may be *dispensed* with, and the *Figure* or *Type* may *cease*, when the *Substance* and *Anti-type* comes to be enjoyed; as it doth in this Case, which shall hereafter be made appear.

Proof § IV. *Fourthly*: That the One Baptism of Christ is not a *Washing* with *Water*, ap-

The plainest Definition of the Baptism of Christ in all the Bible.

pears from 1 Pet. 3. 21. *The like Figure, whereunto even Baptism doth also now save us, (not the putting away of the filth of the Flesh, but the answer of a good Conscience towards God,) by the Resurrection of Jesus Christ.* So plain a definition of Baptism is not in all the Bible: and therefore, seeing it

it is so *Plain*, it may well be preferred to all the coined *definitions* of the *School-men*. The Apostle tells us *first*, *Negatively*, what it is not, *viz.* *Not a putting away of the filth of the Flesh*; then surely it is not a *Washing with Water*, since that is so. *Secondly*, He tells us *Affirmatively*, what it is: *viz.* *The Answer of a good Conscience towards God, by the Resurrection of Jesus Christ*: where he *Affirmatively* Defines it to be the *Answer* (or *Confession*, as the *Syriack* Version hath it) of a good Conscience. Now, this *Answer* cannot be, but where the *Spirit* of God hath purified the *Soul*, and the *Fire* of his *Judgment* hath burned up the *unrighteous nature*; and those, in whom this *Work* is wrought, may be truly said to be *baptized* with the *Baptism* of *Christ*, i. e. of the *Spirit* and of *Fire*. Whatever way then we take this *Definition* of the Apostle of *Christ's Baptism*, it confirmeth our sentence: For if we take the *first* or *Negative* part, *viz.* *That it is not a putting away of the filth of the Flesh*; then it will follow, that *Water-Baptism* is not it, because that is a *putting away of the filth of the Flesh*. If we take the *second* and *Affirmative Definition*, to wit, *That it is the Answer, or Confession of a good Conscience, &c.* then *Water-baptism* is not it; since,

Water Baptism shut out from the *Baptism* of *Christ*.

since, as our *Adversaries* will not deny, *Water-baptism* doth not always imply it, neither is it any necessary Consequence thereof. Moreover, the Apostle in this place doth seem especially to *guard* against those, that might esteem *Water-baptism* the true *Baptism* of Christ; because (left by the *Comparison* induced by him in the preceding verse, betwixt the Souls that were saved in *Noah's Ark*, and us, that are now saved by *Baptism*; left, I say, any should have thence hastily concluded, that because the former were saved by *Water*, this place must needs be taken to speak of *Water-Baptism*) to prevent such a mistake, he plainly affirms, that it is not that, but another thing. He saith not, that it is the *Water*, or the putting away of the filth of the *Flesh*, as accompanied with the Answer of a good Conscience; whereof the one, viz. the *Water*, is the Sacramental Element administered by the Minister; and the other, the Grace or thing signified, Conferred by Christ; but plainly, That it is not the putting away, &c. than which there can be nothing more manifest to Men unprejudicate and judicious. Moreover, *Peter* calls this here, which saves, the *Antitypos*, the *Anti-type*, or the thing figured, whereas it is usually translated, as if the like Figure did now save us; there-

thereby insinuating, that as they were Saved by *Water* in the *Ark*, so are we now by *Water-baptism*. But this *Interpretation* crosseth his sense, he presently after declaring the Contrary, as hath above been observed: and likewise it would Contradict the *Opinion* of all our Opposers. For *Protestants* deny it to be absolutely necessary to *Salvation*: And though *Papists* say, *None are saved without it*; yet in this they admit an *Exception*, as of *Martyrs*, &c. and they will not say, that all that have it, are Saved by *Water-baptism*: which they ought to say, if they will understand by *Baptism* (by which the Apostle saith, we are Saved) *Water-baptism*, for seeing we are saved by this *Baptism*, as those that were in the *Ark*, were Saved by *Water*, and that all those, that were in the *Ark*, were Saved by *Water*; it would then follow, that all those, that have this *Baptism*, are Saved by it. Now this *Consequence* would be false, if it were understood of *Water-baptism*; because many, by the Confession of all, are baptized with *Water*, that are not saved: but this *Consequence* holds most true, if it be understood, as we do, of the *Baptism* of the *Spirit*; since none can have this *Answer of a good Conscience*, and abiding in it, not be Saved by it.

The *Protestants* deny *Water-baptism* its absolute necessity to mens *Salvation*: Altho' the *Papists* say, none can be saved without it, yet grant *Exceptions*.

Fifthly:

Proof
V.

The Effects and
Fruits of
the Baptism of
Christ.

Fifthly: That the One Baptism of Christ is not a Washing with Water, as it hath been proved by the Definition of the One Baptism, so it is also manifest from the Necessary Fruits and Effects of it, which are three-times particularly expressed by the Apostle Paul: As first, Rom. 6. 3, 4. where he saith, That so many of them, as were baptized into Jesus Christ, were baptized into his Death; buried with him by Baptism into Death, that they should walk in Newness of Life: Secondly, to the Gal. 3. 27. he saith positively, For as many of you, as have been baptized into Christ, have put on Christ: and Thirdly, to the Col. 2. 12. he saith, That they were Buried with him in Baptism, and Risen with him through the Faith of the operation of God. It is to be observed here, that the Apostle speaks generally, without any Exclusive Term, but Comprehensive of all: he saith not, Some of you, that were baptized into Christ, have put on Christ; but As many of you: which is as much, as if he had said, Every one of you, that hath been baptized into Christ, hath put on Christ. Whereby it is evident, that this is not meant of Water-baptism, but of the Baptism of the Spirit; because else it would follow, that, whosoever had been baptized with Water-baptism, had put on Christ,

Which Effect as Water-baptism wants.

Christ, and were *Risen* with him; which all acknowledge to be most *Absurd*. Now supposing, all the *Visible Members* of the *Churches* of *Rome*, *Galatia* and *Coloss* had been outwardly baptized with *Water*, (I do not say, they were; but our *Adversaries* will not only readily grant it, but also contend for it) I suppose (I say) the Case so, they will not say, they had all put on *Christ*; since divers Expressions in these *Epistles* to them, shew the contrary. So that the *Apostle* cannot mean *Baptism* with *Water*; and yet that he meaneth the *Baptism* of *Christ*, i. e. of the *Spirit*, cannot be denied; or that the *Baptism*, where-with these were baptized (of whom the *Apostle* here testifies, that they had put on *Christ*) was the *One Baptism*, I think none will call in question. Now admit, as our *Adversaries* Contend, that many in these *Churches*, who had been baptized with *Water*, had not put on *Christ*; it will follow, that notwithstanding that *Water-baptism*, they were not baptized into *Christ*, or with the *Baptism* of *Christ*; seeing as many of them, as were baptized into *Christ*, had put on *Christ*, &c. From all which I thus Argue;

If the *Baptism* with *Water* were the *One* Arg. i:
Baptism, i. e. the *Baptism* of *Christ*;

Concerning Baptism.

*as many as were baptized with Water,
would have put on Christ.*

But the last is false;

Therefore also the first.

And again;

Arg. 2. *Since as many, as are baptized into Christ,
i. e. with the One Baptism, which is
the Baptism of Christ, have put on
Christ; Then Water-baptism is not
the One Baptism, viz. the Baptism
of Christ.*

But the first is true:

Therefore also the last.

Prop.

III.

Prove.

§ V. Thirdly: *Since John's Baptism was
a Figure, and seeing, the Figure gives way
to the Substance, albeit the thing figured re-
main, to wit, the One Baptism of Christ,
yet the other ceaseth, which was the Baptism
of John.*

1.
That
John's
Baptism
was of
Christ's a
Figure.

*That John's Baptism was a Figure of
Christ's Baptism, I judge will not readily
be denied; but in Case it should; it can
easily be proved from the Nature of it,
John's Baptism was a being baptized with
Water; but Christ's is a baptizing with
the Spirit: Therefore John's Baptism must
have been a Figure of Christ's. But fur-
ther, that Water-baptism was John's Bap-
tism, will not be denied; That Water-
baptism is not Christ's Baptism, is already
proved.*

proved. From which doth arise the Confirmation of our Proposition, thus;

There is no Baptism to continue now, but the One Baptism of Christ.

Therefore Water-baptism is not to continue now; because it is not the Baptism of Christ. Arg:

That John's Baptism is Ceased, many of our Adversaries confess: but, if any should alledge it otherwise, it may be easily proved by the express words of John, not only as being insinuated there, where he Contradistinguished his Baptism from that of Christ; but particularly where he saith John 3. 30. He [Christ] must Increase, but I [John] must Decrease. From whence it clearly follows, that the Increasing or taking place of Christ's Baptism is the Decreasing or abolishing of John's Baptism: so that, if Water-baptism was a particular part of John's Ministry, and is no part of Christ's Baptism, as we have already proved, it will necessarily follow, that it is not to Continue.

11.
John's
Baptism is
Ceased, our
Opposers
confess.

If Water-baptism had been to continue a Perpetual Ordinance of Christ in his Church, he would either have practised it himself, or Commanded his Apostles so to do. Arg:

But that he practised it not, the Scripture

Concerning Baptism.

plainly affirms, John 4. 2. And that be Commanded his Disciples to baptize with Water, I could never yet read. [As for what is alledged, that Mat. 28. 19, &c. (where he bids them baptize) is to be understood of Water-baptism, that is but to beg the Question, and the grounds for that shall be hereafter examined.]

Therefore to baptize with Water is no Perpetual Ordinance of Christ to his Church.

This hath had the more Weight with me, because I find not any *standing Ordinance* or *Appointment* of Christ necessary to Christians, for which we have not either *Christ's own Practice*, or *Command*, as to obey all the Commandments, which comprehend both our *Duty* towards God and Man, &c. and where the *Gospel* requires more than the *Law*; which is abundantly signified in the 5th and 6th Chapters of *Matthew*, and elsewhere. Besides as to the *Duties* of *Worship*, he exhorts us to *Meet*, promising his *Presence*; commands to *Pray*, *Preach*, *Watch*, &c. and gives *Precepts* concerning some *Temporary things*, as the *Washing* of *one anothers Feet*, the *breaking of Bread*, hereafter to be discussed: only for this one thing of *baptising* with *Water* (though so
car-

earnestly contended for) we find not any Precept of Christ.

§ VI. But to make *Water-baptism* a necessary Institution of the *Christian Religion*, which is Pure and Spiritual, and not Carnal and Ceremonial, is to derogate from the *New Covenant-Dispensation*, and set up the *Legal Rites and Ceremonies*, of which this of *Baptism*, or *Washing with Water*, was one; as appears from *Heb. 9. 10.* where the Apostle speaking thereof, saith,

that it stood only in Meats and Drinks, and divers Baptisms, and Carnal Ordinances imposed, until the Time of Reformation: If then the Time of Reformation, or the Dispensation of the Gospel, which puts an end to the Shadows, be come, then such Baptisms and Carnal Ordinances are no more to be imposed, For how Baptism with Water comes now to be a Spiritual Ordinance more than before in the time of the Law, doth not appear; seeing it is but Water still, and a Washing of the Outward Man, and a putting away of the filth of the Flesh still: And as before those, that were so Washed, were not thereby made perfect, as pertaining to the Conscience, neither are they at this day; as our Adversaries must needs acknowledge, and Experience abundantly sheweth. So that the matter of it, which

III.

The Gospel puts an end to Carnal Ordinances.

is a *Washing* with *Water*, and the Effects of it, which is only an *Outward Cleansing*, being still the same, how comes *Water-baptism* to be less a *Carnal Ordinance* now, than before?

Obj. 1. If it be said, That God *confers inward Grace* upon some, that are now baptized?

Ans. So no doubt he did also upon some, that used those *Baptisms* among the *Jews*.

Obj. 2. Or if it be said; Because 'tis commanded by Christ now under the *New Covenant*.

Ans. I Answer First, That's to beg the Question; of which hereafter.

But Secondly, We find, That where the Matter of Ordinances is the same, and the End the same, they are never accounted more or less *Spiritual*, because of their different Times. Now, was not God the Author of the *Purifications* and *Baptisms* under the *Law*? Was not *Water* the Matter of them, which is so now? Was not the End of them to signify an *Imputed Purifying* by an *Outward Washing*? And is not that alledged to be the End still? And are the necessary Effects or Consequences of it any better now, than before, since men are now by virtue of *Water-baptism*, as a necessary Consequence of it, no more than before made *Inwardly Clean*? And if some by God's Grace, that are baptized with *Water*,

Men are
no more
now than
before by
Water-bap-
tism in-
wardly
cleansed.

are inwardly purified, so were some also under the *Law*: So that this is not any *Necessary Consequence* nor *Effect* neither of this nor that *Baptism*. It is then plainly *Repugnant to Right Reason*, as well as to the *Scripture-Testimony*, to affirm that to be a *Spiritual Ordinance* now, which was a *Carnal Ordinance* before, if it be still the same both as to its *Author, Matter and End*, however made to vary in some small *Circumstances*: The *Spirituality* of the *New Covenant*, and of its *Worship* established by Christ, consisted not in such superficial *Alterations of Circumstances*; but after another manner. Therefore let our *Adversaries* shew us, if they can, (without begging the *Question*, and building upon some one or other of their own *Principles* denied by us) whierever Christ appointed or ordained any *Institution or Observation* under the *New Covenant*, as belonging to the Nature of it, or such a necessary part of its *Worship*, as is perpetually to *Continue*, which being one in *Substance and Effects*, (I speak of *necessary* not *accidental Effects*) yet because of some small *difference in Form or Circumstance*, was before *Carnal*, notwithstanding it was *commanded by God* under the *Law*, but now is become *Spiritual*, because *commanded by Christ* under the *Gospel*?

Concerning Baptism.

spel? And if they cannot do this, then if *Water-baptism* was once a *Carnal Ordinance*, as the Apostle positively affirms it to have been, it remains a *Carnal Ordinance* still; and if a *Carnal Ordinance*, then no necessary part of the Gospel, or *New Covenant-Dispensation*; and if no necessary part of it, then not needful to *Continue*, nor to be *Practised* by such, as live and walk under this *Dispensation*. But in this, as in most other things (according as we have often observed) our *Adversaries Judaize*, and renouncing the *Glorious* and *Spiritual Privileges* of the *New Covenant*, are sticking in, and cleaving to the *Rudiments* of the *Old*, both in *Doctrine* and *Worship*, as being more suited and agreeable to their *Carnal Apprehensions* and *Natural Senses*. But we on the contrary travel above all to lay hold upon, and cleave unto the *Light* of the *Glorious Gospel* Revealed unto us: And the *Harmony* of the *Truth* we profess in this, may appear, by briefly observing, how in all things we follow the *Spiritual Gospel* of Christ, as contradistinguished from the *Carnality* of the *Legal Dispensation*; while our *Adversaries* through rejecting this Gospel, are still labouring under the burthen of the *Law*, which neither they, nor their Fathers were able to bear.

The *Law*
 distinguished
 from the
Gospel.

For the Law and Rule of the Old Covenant and Jews was Outward, written in Tablets of Stone and Parchments: So also is that of our Adversaries. But the Law of the New Covenant is Inward and Perpetual, written in the Heart: So is ours.

The Outward Baptism, Worship, Law, distinguishes from the Inward.

The Worship of the Jews was Outward and Carnal, limited to set Times, Places and Persons, and performed according to Set, Prescribed Forms and Observations; so is that of our Adversaries. But the Worship of the New Covenant is neither limited to Time, Place nor Person, but is performed in the Spirit, and in Truth, and is not acted according to set Forms and Prescriptions, but as the Spirit of God immediately acts, moves and leads, whether it be to Preach, Pray, or Sing; and such is also our Worship.

So like wise the Baptism among the Jews under the Law was an outward Washing with outward Water, only to Typifie an inward Purification of the Soul, which did not necessarily follow upon those that were thus baptized: But the Baptism of Christ under the Gospel, is the Baptism of the Spirit and of Fire; not the putting away of the filth of the Flesh, but the Answer of a good Conscience towards God: And such is the Baptism, that we labour to be baptized withal, and contend for.

Arg.

§ VII. But again: If *Water-baptism* had been an *Ordinance* of the *Gospel*, then the *Apostle Paul* would have been sent to *Administer* it; but he declares positively *1 Cor. i. 17. That Christ sent him not to Baptize, but to Preach the Gospel.* The *Reason* of that *Consequence* is undeniable, because the *Apostle Paul's Commission* was as large, as that of any of them, and consequently he being in special Manner the *Apostle of Christ* to the *Gentiles*, if *Water-baptism* (as our *Adversaries* contend) be to be accounted the *badge* of *Christianity*, he had more need than any of the rest to be sent to baptize with *Water*, that he might *Mark* the *Gentiles Converted* by him, with that *Christian Sign*. But indeed, the *Reason* holds better thus: That since *Paul* was the *Apostle* of the *Gentiles*, and that in his *Ministry* he doth through all (as by his *Epistles* appears) labour to wean them from the former *Jewish Ceremonies* and *Observations*, (though in so doing he was sometimes undeservedly judged by others of his *Brethren*, who were unwilling to lay aside those *Ceremonies*) therefore his *Commission* (though as full, as to the *Preaching* of the *Gospel* and *New Covenant Dispensation*, as that of the other *Apostles*) did not require of him, that he should lead

IV.
That *Water-baptism* is no *Badge* of *Christians*, like *Circumcision* of the *Jews*.

those Converts into such Jewish Observations, and Baptisms; however that Practice was Indulged in, and practised by the other Apostles among their Jewish Proselytes: for which cause *he thanks God, that he baptized so few*; intimating, that what he did therein, he did not by vertue of his Apostolick Commission, but rather in Condescendence to their Weakness; even as at another time he Circumcised Timothy.

1 Cor. 1.

14

Paul was not sent to baptize.

Our Adversaries, to evade the Truth of Obj. 1. this Testimony, usually alledge, That by this is only to be understood, that he was not sent principally to baptize, not that he was not sent at all.

But this Exposition, since it Contradicts the positive Words of the Text, and has no better Foundation, than the Affirmation of its Assertors, is justly rejected as spurious, until they bring some better Proof for it: He saith not, *I was not sent principally to baptize*; but, *I was not sent to baptize*.

Answ.

As for what they urge by way of Confirmation from other places of Scripture, where [*not*] is to be so taken, as where it's said, *I will have Mercy, and not Sacrifice*, which is to be understood, that God requires principally Mercy, not excluding Sacrifices.

Confirm.

Matth. 9.

13.

Hos. 6. 6.

Concerning Baptism.

I say, this Place is abundantly Explained by the following words [*and the Knowledge of God more than burnt-Offerings:*] by which it clearly appears, that *burnt-Offerings*, which are one with *Sacrifices*, are not Excluded. But there is no such word added in that of *Paul*, and therefore the *Parity* is not demonstrated to be alike, and consequently the *Instance* not sufficient; unless they can prove, that it ought so to be admitted here: Else we might interpret by the same Rule all other Places of *Scripture* the same way; As where the *Apostle* saith, *1 Cor. 2. 5. That your Faith might not stand in the Wisdom of Men, but in the Power of God*; it might be understood, it shall not stand *Principally* so. How might the *Gospel* by this Liberty of *Interpretation* be *Perverted*?

Obj. 2. If it be said, *That the Abuse of this Baptism among the Corinthians, in dividing themselves according to the Persons, by whom they were baptized, made the Apostle speak so; but that the Abuse of a thing doth not abolish it.*

Ans. I Answer; It is true, it doth not, provided the thing be *lawful* and *necessary*; and that, no doubt, the *Abuse* abovesaid gave the *Apostle* occasion so to write: But let it from this be considered, how the *Apostle*

postle excludes *Baptizing*, not *Preaching*,
 though the *Abuse* [mark] proceeded from
 that no less, than from the other. For
 these *Corinthians* did denominate them-
 selves from those different Persons, by
 whose *Preaching* (as well as from those,
 by whom they were *baptized*) they were
Converted, as by the 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8. ver.
 of the 3^d *Ch.* may appear; and yet for to
 remove that *Abuse*, the Apostle doth not
 say, *he was not sent to preach*; nor yet doth
 he rejoice, that he had only *preached* to a
 few; because *preaching* being a *standing Or-*
dinance in the Church, is not because of any
Abuse, that the Devil may tempt any to
 make of it, to be *forborn*, by such as are
 called to perform it by the Spirit of God;
 wherefore the Apostle accordingly Chap.
 3. 8, 9, informs them as to that, how to
 Remove that *Abuse*: But as to *Water-bap-*
tism, for that it was no *standing Ordinance*
 of Christ, but only practised as in *Conde-*
scendence to the *Jews*, and by some Apc-
 stles to some *Gensiles* also, there so soon as
 the Apostle perceived the *Abuse* of it; he let
 the *Corinthians* understand, how little
 stress was to be laid upon it; by shewing
 them that he was glad, that he had admi-
 nistred this *Ceremony* to so few of them,
 and by telling them plainly that it was no
 part

That
Preaching
 is a *stand-*
ing Ordi-
nance, and
 not to be
forborn.

part of his *Commission*, neither that, which he was sent to *Administer*.

Query. Some ask us, *How we know, that Baptizing here is meant of Water, and not of the Spirit? Which if it be, then it will exclude Baptism of the Spirit, as well as of Water.*

Ans. I Answer: Such as ask the Question, I suppose speak it not as doubting, that this was said of *Water-baptism*; which is more than manifest. For since the Apostle Paul's Message was to turn People from Darkness to Light, and Convert them to God; and that as many as are thus turned and converted (so as to have the Answer of a good Conscience towards God, and to have put on Christ, and be arisen with him in Newness of Life) are baptized with the Baptism of the Spirit; but who will say, that only these few mentioned there to be baptized by Paul, were come to this? or that to turn or bring them to this Condition, was not (even admitting our Adversaries Interpretation) is principally a part of Paul's Ministry, as any other? Since then our Adversaries do take this place for *Water-baptism* (as indeed it is) we may lawfully, taking it to also, urge it upon them. Why the Word *Baptism* and *baptizing* is used by the Apostle, where that of *Water*, and not of the *Spirit*, is only understood, shall hereafter be

That which Con-
verts to
Christ, is
Baptism of
the Spirit.

be spoken to. I come now to consider the **Part II.**
Reasons alledged by such as plead for *Water-baptism*; which are also the *Objections*
 used against the *Discontinuance* of it.

§ VIII. *First, Some Object, That Christ, Obj. 1.*
who had the Spirit above measure, was not-
withstanding baptized with Water. As *Nic.*
Arnold. against this *These, Sect. 46.* of his
Theological Exercitation.

I Answer: So was he also *Circumcised*; *Ans.*
 it will not follow from thence, that *Cir-*
cumcision is to *Continue*. For it behoved *Why*
Christ to fulfil all *Righteousness*, not only *Christ was*
 the *Ministry* of *John*, but the *Law* also; *baptized*
 therefore did he observe the *Jewish Feasts*
 and *Rites*, and kept the *Passover*: It will
 not then follow, that *Christians* ought to
 do so now. And therefore *Christ Matth.*
3. 15. gives *John* this reason of his being
 baptized, desiring him to *Suffer it to be so*
now: Whereby he sufficiently intimates,
 that he intended not thereby to *Perpetuate*
 it, as an *Ordinance* to his *Disciples*.

Secondly, They Object Matth. 28. 19. Obj. 2.
Go ye therefore, and teach all Nations, bap-
tizing them in the Name of the Father, and
of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.

This is the great *Objection*, and upon *Ans.*
 which they build the *Whole Superstructure*:
 Whereunto the first general and sound An-
 swer

What Baptism
Christ doth mean
in Matth.
28?

swer is, by granting the whole; but putting them to prove, that *Water* is *here meant*, since the *Text* is *silent* of it. And though in reason it be sufficient upon our part, that we *Concede* the *whole* expressed in the place, but deny, that it is by *Water*, which is an *Addition* to the *Text*; yet I shall premise some *Reasons*, why we do so; and then consider the *Reasons* alledged by those, that will have *Water* to be here understood.

Arg. I. The *First* is a *Maxime* yielded to by all, that

We ought not to go from the literal signification of the Text, except some urgent necessity force us thereunto.

But no *urgent Necessity* in this place forceth us thereunto.

Therefore we *ought not to go from it.*

Arg. II. Secondly, That *Baptism*, which Christ commanded his Apostles, was the *one Baptism*, *id est*, his *own Baptism*.

But the *one Baptism*, which is *Christ's Baptism*; is not with *Water* (as we have already proved.)

Therefore the *Baptism* commanded by Christ to his Apostles, was not *Water-baptism*.

Arg. III Thirdly: That *Baptism*, which Christ commanded his Apostles, was such,

that as many as were therewith baptized, did put on Christ.

But this is not true of *Water-baptism*.

Therefore, &c.

Fourthly: The Baptism commanded by Arg. IV, Christ to his Apostles, was not John's Baptism:

But Baptism with Water was John's Baptism:

Therefore, &c.

But First, They alledge, That Christ's ^{Allegat. 14} Baptism, though a Baptism with Water, did differ from John's, because John only baptized with Water unto Repentance, but Christ commands his Disciples to baptize in the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; reckoning, that in this Form there lieth a great difference betwixt the Baptism of John, and that of Christ.

I Answer, as to that, John's Baptism ^{Answer} was unto Repentance, the Difference lieth not there, because so is Christ's also. For our Adversaries will not deny, but that Adult Persons, that are baptized, ought, ere they be admitted to it, to Repent and Confess their Sins; yea, and that Infants with a respect to, and Consideration of their Baptism, ought to Repent and Confess: So that the difference lieth not here; since this of Repentance and Confession agrees as

Concerning Baptism.

well to *Christ's*, as to *John's Baptism*. But in this our *Adversaries* are divided: for *Calvin* will have *Christ's* and *John's* to be all one; *Inst. lib. 4. cap. 15. Sect. 7, 8.* Yet they do differ, and the difference is, in that the one is by *Water*, the other not, &c.

Secondly: As to what *Christ* saith, in commanding them to baptize in the Name of the Father, Son and Spirit, I confess that states the Difference, and it is great; but that lies not only in admitting *Water-baptism* in this different Form, by a bare expressing of these Words: For as the Text saith no such thing, neither do I see, how it can be inferred from it. For the Greek is εις το ονομα, that is, into the Name; now the Name of the Lord is often taken in Scripture for something else, than a bare sound of Words, or literal Expression, even for his *Vertue* and *Power*, as may appear from *Psalms 54. 3. Cant. 1. 3. Prov. 18. 10.* and in many more. Now, that the Apostles were by their Ministry to baptize the Nations into this Name, *Vertue* and *Power*, and that they did so, is evident, by these Testimonies of *Paul* above mentioned, where he saith, That as many of them, as were baptized into Christ, have put on Christ: This must have been a baptizing into

Of the Name of the Lord, how taken in Scripture.

The Baptizing into Christ, where

into the Name, i. e. Power and Vertue, and not a meer formal Expression of Words adjoined with *Water-baptism*; because, as hath been above observed, it doth not follow, as a *natural* or *necessary Consequence* of it. I would have those, who desire to have their *Faith* built upon no other foundation, than the *Testimony* of *God's Spirit*, and *Scriptures of Truth*, throughly to Consider, whether there can be any thing further alledged for this *Interpretation*, than what the prejudice of *Education* and influence of *Tradition* hath imposed: Perhaps it may stumble the unwary and inconsiderate Reader, as if the very *Character* of *Christianity* were abolished, to tell him plainly, that this *Scripture* is not to be understood of *baptizing* with *Water*, and that this form of *baptizing* in the Name of *Father, Son* and *Spirit*, hath no warrant from *Matth. 28. &c.*

For which, besides the Reason taken from the Signification of [the Name] as being the *Vertue* and *Power* above expressed, let it be considered, that, if that had been a *Form prescribed* by *Christ* to his Apostles, then surely, they would have made use of that *Form* in the administering of *Water-baptism* to such as they baptized with *Water*; but though particular men-

Whether
Christ did
prescribe
a Form of
Baptism in
Matth. 28.

tion be made in divers places of the *Acts*, *Who* were baptized, and *how*? and though it be particularly expressed, that they baptized *such* and *such*, as *Acts* 2. 41: 8. 12, 13, 38: 9. 18: 10. 48: 16. 15: 18. 8. yet there is not a Word of this *Form*. And in two places, *Acts* 8. 16: 19. 5. it is said of some, that they were baptized in the *Name* of the Lord *Jesus*; by which it yet more appears, that either the *Author* of this *History* hath been very defective, who having so often occasion to mention this, yet omit-
teth so substantial a part of Baptism, (which were to accuse the *Holy Ghost*, by whose guidance *Luke* wrote it) or else that the Apostles did no ways understand, that Christ by his *Commission* Matth. 28. did injoin them such a *Form* of *Water-baptism*, seeing they did not use it. And therefore it is safer to conclude, that what they did in administering *Water-baptism*, they did not by vertue of that *Commission*; else they would have so used it: For our *Adversaries*, I suppose, would judge it a great *Heresie* to Administer *Water-baptism* without that, or only in the *Name* of *Jesus*, without mention of *Father* or *Spirit*, as it is expressly said they did, in the two places above-cited.

Alleg. II. Secondly, They say: If this were not understood

derstood of Water-baptism, it would be a Tautology, and all one with Teaching.

I say, *Nay*: Baptizing with the Spirit is somewhat further, than Teaching or Informing the Understanding; for it imports a Reaching to, and melting the Heart, whereby it is turned, as well as the Understanding informed. Besides, we find often in the Scripture, that Teaching and Instructing are put together without any Absurdity or needless Tautology; and yet these two have a greater Affinity, than teaching and baptizing with the Spirit.

How
Teaching
and Bapti-
sing differ.

Thirdly, They say; Baptism in this Place must be understood with Water, because it is the Action of the Apostles; and so cannot be the Baptism of the Spirit, which is the Work of Christ, and his Grace, not of Man, &c.

Alleg. III.

I Answer: Baptism with the Spirit, though not wrought without Christ and his Grace, is instrumentally done by Men, fitted of God for that purpose; and therefore no Absurdity follows, that Baptism with the Spirit should be expressed, as the Action of the Apostles: For though it be Christ by his Grace, that gives Spiritual Gifts, yet the Apostle, Rom. I. II. speaks of his Imparting to them Spiritual Gifts; and he tells the Corinthians, that he had begot-

The Bap-
tism with
the Spirit
Ascribed to
Godly, as a
as instru-
ments.

ten them through the Gospel, 1 Cor. 4. 15. And yet to beget People unto the Faith, is the work of Christ and his Grace, not of Men. To Convert the Heart is properly the Work of Christ; and yet the Scripture often-times ascribes it to Men, as being the Instruments: And since Paul's Commission was to turn People from Darkness to Light, though that be not done without Christ co-operating by his Grace, so may also baptizing with the Spirit be expressed, as performable by Man, as the Instrument, tho' the Work of Christ's Grace be needful to concur thereunto: So that it is no Absurdity to say, that the Apostles did Administer the Baptism of the Spirit.

Alleg. IV. Lastly, They say, That since Christ saith here, that he will be with his Disciples to the end of the World, therefore Water-baptism must continue so long.

Ans. If he had been speaking here of Water-baptism, then that might have been urged; but seeing that is denied, and proved to be false, nothing from thence can be gathered; He speaking of the Baptism of the Spirit, which we freely confess doth remain to the End of the World, yea, so long as Christ's Presence abideth with his Children.

Obj. III. § IX. Thirdly, They Object the Con-

stant

stant Practice of the Apostles in the Primitive Church, who, they say, did always Admini- Water-baptism to such, as they Converted to the Faith of Christ; And hence also they further urge, that of Matth. 28. to have been meant of Water, or else the Apostles did not understand it, in that in baptizing they used Water; or that in so doing they walked without a Commission.

I Answer: That it was the *Constant Practice of the Apostles*, is denied; for we have shewn in the Example of *Paul*, that it was not so; since it were most absurd to judge, that he *Converted* only those few, even of the *Church of Corinth*, whom he saith he *baptized*; nor were it less absurd to think, that that was a *constant Apostolick Practice*, which he, that was not *Inferior to the Chiefest of the Apostles*, and who declares, he laboured as much as they all, *rejoyceth*, he was so little in. But further, *How the Ap. Acts Baptized.* the *Conclusion* inferred from the *Apostles Practice of baptizing with Water*, to evince, that they understood *Matth. 28. of Water-baptism*, doth not hold: For though they *baptized with Water*, it will not follow, that either they did it by vertue of that *Commission*, or that they mistook that place; nor can there be any *Mediums* brought, that will infer such a *Conclusion*.

As to the other insinuated Absurdity, *That they did it without a Commission*; It is none at all: For they might have done it by a *Permission*, as being in use, before *Christ's Death*; and because the People *nursed up with Outward Ceremonies*, could not be weaned wholly from them. And thus they used other things, as *Circumcision*, and *legal Purifications*, which yet they had no *Commission* from *Christ* to do, (to which we shall speak more at length in the following *Proposition* concerning the *Supper*.)

Object. But if from the *Sameness* of the *Word*, because *Christ bids them baptize*, and they afterwards in the *Use of Water* are said to baptize, it be judged probable, *that they did understand that Commission*, Matth. 28. *to authorize them to baptize with Water, and accordingly practised it.*

Ans. Although it should be granted, that for a *season* they did so far *mistake* it, as to judge, that *Water* belonged to that *Baptism*, (which however I find no necessity of granting) yet I see not any great Absurdity would thence follow. For it is plain, they did *mistake* that *Commission*, as to a main part of it, for a *Season*; as where he bids them, *Go teach all Nations*, since some time after they judged it unlawful to *Teach the Gentiles*: Yea, *Peter* himself scrupled

it, until by a *Vision* constrained thereunto ; for which after he had done it, he was for a *season* (until they were better informed) judged by the rest of his *Brethren*. Now, The Apo-
stles did
scruples
the Teach-
ing the
Gentils. if the *Education* of the *Apostles*, as *Jen's*, and their Propensity to adhere and stick to the *Jewish Religion*, did so far influence them, that even after *Christ's Resurrection* and the *pouring forth* of the *Spirit*, they could not receive nor admit of the *Teaching* of the *Gentiles*, though *Christ* in his *Com-
mission* to them, commanded them to *Preach* to them ; what further Absurdity were it to suppose, that through the like *Mistake* the *Chiefest* of them, having been the *Dis-
ciples* of *John*, and his *Baptism* being so much prized there among the *Jews*, that they also took *Christ's Baptism*, intended by him of the *Spirit*, to be that of *Water*, which was *John's*, and accordingly practised it for a season ; it suffices us, that, if they were so *mistaken* (though I say not, that they were so) they did not always remain under that *Mistake* : Else *Peter* would not have said of the *Baptism*, which now saves, that it is not a putting away of the filth of the *Flesh* ; which certainly *Water-baptism* is.

But further they urge much *Peter's* baptizing *Cornelius* ; In which they press two things ;

Concerning Baptism.

things; First, That *Water-baptism* is used even to those, that had received the Spirit Secondly, That it is said positively, he commanded them to be baptized, Acts 10. 47, 48.

But neither of these doth necessarily infer *Water-baptism* to belong to the *New Covenant-Dispensation*, nor yet to be a *Perpetual standing Ordinance* in the Church. For

Whether
Peter's
Baptizing
some with
Water
makes it a
standing
Ordinance
to the
Church?

First, All that this will amount to, was, That Peter at that time baptized these Men; but that he did it by vertue of that *Commission*, Matth. 28. remains yet to be proved. And how doth the baptizing with *Water*, after the receiving of the *Holy Ghost* prove the Case more, than the use of *Circumcision* and other *Legal Rites* acknowledged to have been acted by him afterwards? Also no wonder, if Peter, that thought it strange (notwithstanding all that had been professed before, and spoken by Christ) that the *Gentiles* should be made *Partakers* of the Gospel, and with great difficulty, not without a very extraordinary Impulse thereunto, was brought to come to them, and eat with them, was apt to put this Ceremony upon them; which being, as it were, the particular Dispensation of John, the Fore-runner of Christ, seemed to have greater Affinity with the Gospel, than the other Jewish Ceremonies

remones then used by the Church: but that will no ways infer our *Adversaries Conclusion*. Secondly, As to these Words, *And he commanded them to be baptized*, it declareth matter of *Fact*, not of *Right*; and amounteth to no more, than that *Peter* did at that time *pro hic & nunc*, Command those persons to be *baptized* with *Water*; which is not denied: but it saith nothing, that *Peter* commanded *Water-baptism* to be a *Standing* and *Perpetual Ordinance* to the Church; neither can any Man of sound Reason say (if he heed what he says) that a *Command* in matter of *Fact* to *Particular* Persons, doth infer the thing commanded to be of *general* obligation to all, if it be not other ways bottomed upon some *Positive Precept*. Why doth *Peter's* Commanding *Cornelius* and his *Household* to be *baptized* at that time, infer *Water-baptism* to *Continue*, more than his *Constraining* (which is more than Commanding) the *Gentiles* in general to be *Circumcised*, and observe the *Law*? We find, that at that time, when *Peter* baptized *Cornelius*, it was not determined, whether the *Gentiles* should not be *Circumcised*; but on the contrary, it was the most *general Sense* of the Church, that *they should*: And therefore no wonder, if they thought it need-

needful at that time, that they should be baptized, which had more *Affinity* with the Gospel, and was a Burthen less grievous.

Obj. IV. § X. *Fourthly*, They Object from the Signification of the Word [*baptize*] which is as much as to Dip and Wash with Water, alledging thence, that the very Word imports a being baptized with Water.

Ans^r.

Baptizing
signifies
Dipping or
Washing
with Wa-
ter.

This Objection is very weak. For since baptizing with Water was a Rite among the Jews, as Paulus Riccius sheweth, even before the coming of John; therefore that Ceremony received that Name from the Nature of the Practice, as used both by the Jews and by John. Yea we find, that Christ and his Apostles frequently make use of these Terms to a more Spiritual Signification: Circumcision was only used and understood among the Jews, to be that of the Flesh; but the Apostle tells us of the Circumcision of the Heart and Spirit, made without Hands. So that, though Baptism was used among the Jews, only to signify a Washing with Water, yet both John, Christ, and his Apostles, speak of a being baptized with the Spirit and with Fire, which they make the Peculiar Baptism of Christ, as contradistinguished from that of Water, which was John's (as is above-shewn.)

So

So that, though *Baptism* among the *Jews* was only understood of *Water*, yet among *Christians* it is very well understood of the *Spirit* without *Water*; as we see *Christ* and his *Apostles* *spiritually* to *understand* things, under the *Terms* of what had been *Shadows* before. Thus *Christ* speaking of his *Body*, (though the *Jews* mistook him) said, he would *Destroy* this *Temple*, and *build it again in three days*; and many more, that might be instanced. But if the *Etymology* of the Word should be tenaciously adhered to, it would militate against most of our *Adversaries*, as well as against us. For the *Greek* *βαπτίζω* signifies *Immergo*, to *βαπτίζω*
Immergo,
Immergo, to
plunge and
dip in. plunge and dip in, and that was the proper use of *Water-baptism* among the *Jews*, and also by *John*, and the *Primitive Christians*, who used it; whereas our *Adversaries* for the most part only *Sprinkle* a little *Water* upon the *Forehead*, which doth not at all answer to the Word [*Baptism*.] Yea those of old among *Christians*, that used *Water-baptism*, thought this *dipping* and *plunging* so needful, that they thus *dipped Children*: And forasmuch as it was judged, that it might prove hurtful to some weak Constitutions, *Sprinkling*, to prevent that hurt, was introduced; yet then it was likewise appointed, that such, as were only *sprinkled*, Those that
of old used
Water-bap-
tism were
dips and
plunged;
and those
that were
only
sprinkled,
were not
admitted
to any of
see in the
Church;
and why?

led, and not dipped, should not be admitted to have any Office in the Church, as not being sufficiently baptized. So that, if our Adversaries will stick to the Word, they must alter their Method of Sprinkling.

Obj. V. Fifthly, They Object, John 3. 5. Except a Man be born again of Water and of the Spirit, &c. hence inferring the necessity of Water-baptism, as well as of the Spirit.

Ans. But if this prove any thing, it will prove Water-baptism to be of absolute Necessity: And therefore Protestants rightly affirm, when this is urged upon them by Papists, to evince the absolute Necessity of Water-baptism, that [Water] is not here understood of Outward Water; but mystically of an Inward Cleansing and Washing. Even as where Christs speaks of being baptized with Fire, it is not to be understood of outward material Fire, but only of Purifying, by a Metonymy; because to purifie is a proper Effect of Fire, as to Wash and make clean is of Water. Therefore the Scripture alludes to Water, where it can as little be so understood: As where we are said to be Saved by the Washing of Regeneration, Tit. 3. 5. Yea, Peter saith expressly in the place often cited, as Calvin well observes; That the Baptism, which saves, is not the putting away of the filth of the Flesh: So that, since

The Water that Regenerates, is Mystical and Inward.

In the 4th. Book of his Instr. Chap. 15.

[Wa-

[*Water*] cannot be understood of *outward Water*, this can serve nothing to prove *Water-baptism*.

If it be said, that [*Water*] imports here Object. necessitatem Præcepti, though not Medii.

I Answer; That is first to take it for *Ans.* granted, that *outward Water* is here understood; the contrary whereof we have already proved. Next, *Water* and the *Spirit* are placed here together, [*Except* ^{Necessitas Præcepti} and *Medii*, ^{urged.} *a Man be born of Water and the Spirit*]

where the *Necessity* of the one is urged, as much as of the other. Now if the *Spirit* be absolutely necessary, so will also *Water*: And then we must either say, that *To be born of the Spirit*, is not absolutely necessary, which all acknowledge to be false; or else that *Water* is absolutely necessary, which, as *Protestants*, we affirm and have proved, is false: else we must confess, that *Water* is not here understood of *outward Water*. For to say, that when *Water* and the *Spirit* are placed here just together, and in the same manner, though there be not any difference or ground for it visible in the *Text*, or deduceable from it, That the necessity of *Water* is here *Præcepti*, but not *Medii*, but the necessity of the *Spirit* is both *Medii* and *Præcepti*; is indeed confidently to affirm, but not to prove.

Sixthly,

Obj. VI. *Sixthly, and lastly, They Object ; That the Baptism of Water is a visible Sign or Badge, to distinguish Christians from Infidels, even as Circumcision did the Jews.*

Ans. I Answer ; This saith nothing at all, unless it be proved to be a *necessary Precept*, or part of the *New Covenant-Dispensation* ; it not being lawful to us to impose *outward Ceremonies and Rites*, and say, they will

Circumcision a Seal of the first Covenant. Water-baptism falsely called a Badge of Christianity. Which is the Badge of Christianity?

distinguish us from *Infidels*. *Circumcision* was positively commanded, and said to be a *Seal of the first Covenant* ; but as we have already proved, that there is no such Command for *Baptism*, so there is not any Word in all the *New Testament*, calling it a *Badge of Christianity*, or *Seal of the New Covenant* : And therefore to conclude, it is so, because *Circumcision* was so, (unless some better Proof be alledged for it) is miserably to beg the Question. *The professing of Faith in Christ, and a holy Life answering thereunto, is a far better Badge of Christianity, than any outward Washing ; which yet answers not to that of Circumcision, since that affixed a Character in the Flesh, which this doth not : So that a Christian is not known to be a Christian by his being baptized, especially when he was a Child, unless he tell them so much. And may not the Professing Faith in Christ signify that*

that as well? I know, there are divers of those, called *Fathers*, that speak much of *Water-baptism*, calling it *Character Christianitatis*; but so did they also of the *Sign* of the *Cross*, and other such things, justly rejected by *Protestants*. For the *Mystery* of *Iniquity*, which began to work even in the Apostles days, soon spoiled the Simplicity and Purity of the Christian Worship; so that not only many *Jewish* Rites were retained, but many *Heathenish* Customs and Ceremonies introduced into the Christian Worship; as particularly that Word [*Sacrament*.] So that it is great folly, especially for *Protestants*, to plead any thing of this from Tradition or Antiquity; for we find, that neither *Papists* nor *Protestants* use these Rites exactly, as the *Ancients* did, who in such things not walking by the most certain Rule of God's Spirit, but doting too much upon Outwards, were very Uncertain. For most of them all, in the Primitive Time did wholly Plunge and Dip those they Baptized; which neither *Papists* nor *Protestants* do: Yea, several of the *Fathers* accused some as *Hereticks* in their Days, for holding some Principles common with *Protestants*, concerning it; as particularly *Augustine* doth the *Pelagians*, for saying, That *In-*

Exorcism
or Adjura-
tion.

The Sign
of the
Cross.

Many in
former A-
ges testifi-
ed against
Water-bap-
tism.

fant's dying Unbaptized, may be saved. And the *Manichees* were Condemned, for denying, that *Grace* is universally given by *Baptism*; and *Julian the Pelagian* by *Augustine*, for denying *Exorcism* and *Insufflation* in the use of *Baptism*: All which things *Protestants* deny also. So that *Protestants* do but foolishly to upbraid us, as if we could not shew any among the *Ancients*, that denied *Water-baptism*; seeing they cannot shew any, whom they acknowledge not to have been *Heretical* in several things, to have used it, nor yet, who using it, did not use also the *Sign* of the *Cross*, and other things with it, which they deny. There were some nevertheless in the darkest Times of *Popery*, who testified against *Water-baptism*. For one *Alanus*, page 103, 104, 107. speaks of some in his Time, that were burnt for the denying of it: For they said, that *Baptism* had no *Efficacy* either in *Children* or *Adult Persons*; and therefore *Men* were not obliged to take *Baptism*: Particularly *Ten Canonicks* (so called) were burnt for that *Crime*, by the Order of *King Robert* of *France*; as *P. Pitheus* tells in his *Fragments* of the *History* of *Guienne*. Which is also confirmed by one *Johannes Floracensis*, a *Munk* (who was famous at that Time) in

in his Epistle to *Oliva*, Abbot of the *Au-
sonian Church*: *I will (saith he) give you
to understand concerning the Heresie, that
was in the City of Orleans on Childer-mas-
day: For it was true, if ye have heard any
thing, that King Robert caused to be burnt
alive nigh F^{orty} teen of that City, of the
Chief of their Clergy, and the more Noble of
their Laicks, who were hateful to God, and
abominable to Heaven and Earth; for they
did stiffly deny the Grace of Holy Baptism,
and also the Consecration of our Lord's Body
and Blood.* The Time of this Deed is no-
ted in these Words by *Papir. Masson.* in
his *Annals of France*, lib. 3. in *Hugh and
Robert, Actum Aureliæ publice Anno Incar-
nationis Domini 1022. Regni Roberti Re-
gis 28. Indictione 5. quando Stephanus He-
resiarcha & Complices ejus damnati sunt &
exusti Aureliæ.*

Ten Cate-
nicks burnt
at Orleans;
and why?

Now for their calling them *Hereticks*
and *Manichees*, we have nothing but the
Testimony of their Accusers; which will
no more invalidate their Testimony for
this Truth against the use of *Water-baptism*,
or give more ground to charge us, as being
one with *Manichees*, than because some,
called by them *Manichees*, do agree with
Protestants in some things, that therefore
Protestants are *Manichees* or *Hereticks*:

which *Protestants* can no ways shun. For the Question is, *Whether, in what they did, they walked according to the Truth testified of by the Spirit in the Holy Scriptures?* So that the Controversie is brought back again to the Scriptures, according to which I suppose I have formerly discussed it.

The Baptism of Infants an Humane Tradition.

As for the latter part of the *Thesis*, denying the Use of *Infant-baptism*, it necessarily follows, from what is above-said. For if *Water-baptism* be Ceased, then surely Baptizing of *Infants* is not warrantable. But those that take upon them to Oppose us in this matter, will have more to do, as to this latter part: For after they have done, what they can, to prove *Water-baptism*; it remains for them to prove, that *Infants* ought to be Baptized. For he that proves *Water-baptism* Ceased, proves, that *Infant-baptism* is Vain: But he that should prove, that *Water-baptism* continues; has not thence proved, that *Infant-baptism* is necessary; That needs something further. And therefore it was a pitiful Subterfuge of *Nic. Arnoldus* against this, to say, That the denying of *Infant-baptism* belonged to the Gangrene of *Anabaptists*; without adding any further Probation.

Concerning the Communion or Participation of the Body and Blood of Christ.

The Communion of the Body and Blood of Christ is Inward and Spiritual, which is the Participation of his Flesh and Blood; by which the Inward Man is daily nourished in the Hearts of those, in whom Christ dwells. Of which things the Breaking of Bread by Christ with his Disciples was a Figure; which they even used in the Church for a time, who had received the Substance, for the sake of the Weak. Even as Abstaining from things strangled, and from Blood, the Washing one anothers Feet, and the Anointing of the Sick with Oil: All which are commanded with no less Authority and Solemnity, than the former; yet seeing they are but the Shadows of better things, they Cease in such, as have obtained the Substance.

1 Cor. 10.
16, 17.
Joh. 6. 2,
33. 5.
1 Cor. 5.
18.
Acts. 15.
John 13.
14.
Jam. 5 14.

§ I. **T**HE Communion of the Body and Blood of Christ, is a Myſtery hid from all natural men in their first,

Concerning the Body

fall'n and degenerate State; which they cannot understand, reach to, nor comprehend, as they there abide, neither as they there are, can they be Partakers of it, nor yet are they able to Discern the Lord's Body. And forasmuch as the Christian World (so called) for the most part hath been still labouring, working, conceiving and imagining in their own natural and unrenewed Understandings about the things of God and Religion, therefore hath this Mystery much been hid and sealed up from them, while they have been contending, quarrelling and fighting one with another about the meer Shadow, Outside and Form, but strangers to the Substance, Life and Vertue.

The Body
and Blood
of Christ is
Spiritual.

§ II. The Body then of Christ, which Believers partake of, is Spiritual, and not Carnal; and his Blood, which they drink of, is pure and Heavenly, and not humane or Elementary; as *Augustin* also affirms of the Body of Christ, which is Eaten, in his *Tractat*, Psal. 98. *Except a Man eat my Flesh, he hath not in him Life Eternal*: And he saith; 'The Words, which I speak unto you, are Spirit and Life, understand spiritually what I have spoken. Ye shall not eat of this Body, which ye see, and drink this Blood, which

‘ which they shall spill, that Crucifie me :
 ‘ *I am the Living Bread, which have descen-*
 ‘ *ded from Heaven* ; he called himself the
 ‘ Bread, who descended from Heaven, ex-
 ‘ horting that we might believe in him,
 ‘ &c.

– If it be asked then, What that Body, *Quest.*
 What that Flesh and Blood is?

– I Answer: It is that Heavenly Seed, *Ansiv.*
 that Divine, Spiritual, Cœlestial Sub-
 stance, of which we spake before in the
 5th and 6th Propositions. This is that *Ve-* What the
biculum Dei, or Spiritual Body of Christ, heavenly
 whereby and where-through he commu- Seed is,
 nicateth Life to Men, and *Salvation to as* whereby
many as believe in him, and receive him ; formerly
 and whereby also Man comes to have Fel- and also
 lowship and Communion with God. now Life
 This is proved from the 6th of *John*, from and Salva-
verse 32. to the end, where Christ speaks tion was
 more at large of this matter, than in any and is Com-
 other place: And indeed, this Evangelist municated.
 and beloved Disciple, who lay in the Bo-
 som of our Lord, gives us a more full ac-
 count of the Spiritual Sayings and Do-
 ctrine of Christ: And it's observable, that
 though he speaks nothing of the Ceremo-
 ny used by Christ, of Breaking Bread with
 his Disciples, neither in his Evangelical
 Account of Christ's Life and Sufferings,

nor in his Epistles ; yet he is more large in this account of the Participation of the Body, Flesh and Blood of Christ, than any of them all. For Christ in this Chapter perceiving, that the Jews did follow him for Love of the Loaves, desires them (*ver. 27.*) *to labour not for the Meat which perisheth, but for that Meat which endureth for ever* : But forasmuch as they, being Carnal in their Apprehensions, and not understanding the Spiritual Language and Doctrine of Christ, did judge the *Manna*, which *Moses* gave their Fathers, to be the most Excellent Bread, as coming from Heaven ; Christ, to rectifie that mistake, and better inform them, affirmeth *First*, That it is not *Moses*, but his Father, that giveth the true Bread from Heaven, *ver. 32.* and 48. *Secondly*, This Bread he calls himself, *ver. 35.* *I am the Bread of Life* : And *ver. 51.* *I am the living Bread, which came down from Heaven* : *Thirdly*, He declares, that this Bread is his Flesh, *ver. 51.* *The Bread, that I will give, is my Flesh* : And *ver. 55.* *For my Flesh is Meat indeed, and my Blood is drink indeed* : *Fourthly*, The Necessity of partaking thereof, *ver. 53.* *Except ye eat the Flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his Blood, ye have no Life in you* : And lastly, *ver. 33.* the blessed Fruits and necessary

The Origin, Nature and Effects of the Body, Flesh and Blood of Christ.

ecessary Effects of this Communion of the Body and Blood of Christ; *This Bread giveth Life to the World*, ver. 50. *He that eateth thereof dyeth not*; ver. 58. *He, that eateth of this Bread, shall live for ever*, ver. 51. *Whoso eateth this Flesh, and drinketh this Blood, shall live for ever*, ver. 54. *And he dwelleth in Christ, and Christ in him*; ver. 56. *And shall live by Christ*; ver. 57. From this large Description of the Origine, Nature and Effects of this Body, Flesh and Blood of Christ, it is apparent, that it is Spiritual, and to be understood of a Spiritual Body, and not of that Body or Temple of Jesus Christ, which was born of the Virgin Mary, and in which he walked, lived and suffered in the Land of Judea; because that it is said, both that it *came down from Heaven*, yea, that it is *He, that came down from Heaven*. Now all Christians at present generally acknowledge, that the outward Body of Christ came not down from Heaven, neither was it that part of Christ, which *came down from Heaven*. And to put the matter out of doubt, when the Carnal Jews would have been so understanding it, he tells them plainly, ver. 63. *It is the Spirit, that quickeneth, but the Flesh profiteth nothing*. This is also founded upon most sound and solid Reason;

Solid Reason, that it is his Spiritual Body, Christ speaks of.

1 Cor. 6.
17.

son; because that it is the Soul, not the Body, that is to be nourished by this Flesh and Blood. Now outward Flesh cannot nourish nor feed the Soul; there is no proportion, nor Analogy betwixt them; neither is the Communion of the Saints with God by a Conjunction and mutual Participation of Flesh, but of the Spirit: *He that is joined to the Lord, is One Spirit*, not one Flesh. For the Flesh (I mean outward Flesh, even such as was that, wherein Christ lived and walked, when upon Earth; and not Flesh, when transposed by a Metaphor, to be understood Spiritually) can only partake of Flesh, as Spirit of Spirit; As the Body cannot feed upon Spirit, neither can the Spirit feed upon Flesh. And that the Flesh here spoken of, is spiritually understood, appears further, in that, that which feedeth upon it, shall never dye: But the Bodies of all Men once dye, yea it behoved the Body of Christ himself to dye. That this Body and Spiritual Flesh and Blood of Christ is to be understood of, that Divine and Heavenly Seed before spoken of by us, appears both by the Nature and Fruits of it. *First*, It's said, *It is that, which cometh down from Heaven, and giveth Life unto the World*: Now, this answers to that Light and Seed, which

is testified of, *John 1.* to be the Light of the World, and the Life of Men. For that Spiritual Light and Seed, as it receives place in mens Hearts, and room to spring up there, is as Bread to the hungry and fainting Soul, that is (as it were) buried and dead in the lusts of the World, which receives Life again; and revives, as it tasteth and partaketh of this heavenly Bread: And they that partake of it, are said to come to Christ; neither can any have it, but by coming to him, and believing in the appearance of his Light in their Hearts; by receiving which, and believing in it, the Participation of this Body and Bread is known. And that Christ understands the same thing here by his Body, Flesh and Blood, which is understood *John 1.* by the Light enlightening every Man, and the Life, &c. appears, for the Light and Life spoken of *John 1.* is said to be Christ; *He is the true Light*: and the Bread and Flesh, &c. spoken of in this 6th of *John*, is called Christ; *I am the Bread of Life*, saith he. Again; *They that received that Light and Life, John 1. 12.* Obtained Power to become the Sons of God, by believing in his Name: So also here, *John 6. 35.* *He that cometh unto this Bread of Life shall not Hunger; and he that believes in him, who*

The Spirit-
ual Light
and Seed is
as Bread to
the Hun-
gry Soul.

Christ's
Outward
and Spirit-
ual Body
distinguish-
ed.

The Patri-
archs did
eat of the
Body, and
Flesh and
Blood of
Christ.

is this Bread shall never thirst. So then, as there was the outward visible Body and Temple of Jesus Christ, which took its Original from the Virgin *Mary*; so there is also the Spiritual Body of Christ, by and through which He, that was the Word in the beginning with God, and was and is GOD, did Reveal himself to the Sons of Men in all Ages, and whereby Men in all Ages come to be made partakers of Eternal Life, and to have Communion and Fellowship with God and Christ. Of which Body of Christ, and Flesh and Blood, if both *Adam*, and *Seth*, and *Enoch*, and *Abraham*, and *Moses*, and *David*, and all the Prophets and Holy Men of God had not eaten, they had not had Life in them, nor could their inward Man have been nourished. Now, as the outward Body and Temple was called Christ, so was also this Spiritual Body no less properly, and that long before that outward Body was in Being. Hence the Apostle saith, 1 Cor. 10. 3, 4. That the *Fathers did all eat the same spiritual Meat, and did all drink the same spiritual Drink: (for they drank of that Spiritual Rock, that followed them; and that Rock was Christ.)* This cannot be understood otherwise than of this Spiritual Body of Christ: Which Spiritual

ritual Body of Christ, though it was the saving Food of the Righteous both before the Law, and under the Law, yet under the Law it was veiled and shadowed, and covered under divers Types, Ceremonies and Observations; yea and not only so, but it was veiled and hid, in some respect, under the outward Temple and Body of Christ, or during the continuance of it; so that the *Jews* could not understand Christ's Preaching about it, while on Earth: And not the *Jews* only, but many of his Disciples judged it an *hard saying*, Joh. 6. 60. *murmured at it, and many from that time* 66. *went back from him, and walked no more with him.* I doubt not, but there are many also at this day professing to be Disciples of Christ, that do as little understand this matter, as those did, and are as apt to be offended and stumble at it, while they are gazing and following after the outward Body; and look not to that, by which the Saints are daily fed and nourished. For as Jesus Christ, in obedience to the Will of the Father, did by the Eternal Spirit offer up that Body for a Propitiation for the Remission of Sins, and finished his Testimony upon Earth thereby, in a most perfect Example of Patience, Resignation and Holiness, that all might be
made

The Divine Light
of Christ
doth make
the Saints
Partakers
of his Body.

made Partakers of the Fruit of that Sacrifice; so hath he likewise poured forth into the Hearts of all Men a measure of that Divine Light and Seed, wherewith he is Cloathed, that thereby reaching unto the Consciences of all, he may Raise them up out of Death and Darkness by his Life and Light; and they thereby may be made Partakers of his Body, and there-through come to have Fellowship with the Father and with the Son.

Quest. § III. If it be asked, How and after what manner Man comes to partake of it, and to be fed by it?

Ansiv. I answer in the plain and exprefs words of Christ; *I am the Bread of Life* (saith he) *he that cometh to me, shall never hunger; he that believeth in me, shall never thirst: And again; For my Flesh is Meat indeed, and my Blood is drink indeed.* So whosoever thou art, that askest this Question, or read'st these Lines, whether thou account'st thy self a Believer, or really feelest by a certain and sad Experience, that thou art yet in the Unbelief, and find'st, that the outward Body and Flesh of Christ is so far from thee, that thou canst not reach it, nor feed upon it: Yea, though thou hast often swallowed down and taken in that which the *Papists* have per-

perswaded thee to be the Real Flesh and Blood of Christ, and hast believed it to be so ; though all thy Senses told thee the Contrary : Or (being a *Lutheran*) hast taken that Bread, in and with, and under which the *Lutherans* have assured thee that the Flesh and Blood of Christ is : Or (being a *Calvinist*) hast partaken of that, which the *Calvinists* say (though a Figure only of the Body) gives them that take it, a Real Participation of the Body, Flesh and Blood of Christ, though they neither know how, nor what way ; I say, if for all this, thou find'st thy Soul yet barren, yea hungry, and ready to starve for want of something thou longest for ; know, that that Light that discovers thy Iniquity to thee, that shews thee thy Barrenness, thy Nakedness, thy Emptiness, is that Body, that thou must partake of, and feed upon : But that till by forsaking Iniquity thou turn'st to it, com'st unto it, receiv'st it, though thou may'st hunger after it, thou canst not be Satisfied with it ; for it hath no Commu-
The *Lutherans* and *Calvinists* Opinion of the Flesh and Blood of Christ in the Supper (so called.)
 2 Cor. 6.
Nor canst thou drink 14.
of the Cup of the Lord, and the Cup of Devils, and be Partaker of the Lord's Table, and the Table of Devils, 1 Cor. 10. 21 ?
 But as thou suffer'st that small Seed of
 Righte-

How the
Inward
Man is
nourisht.

Righteousness to arise in thee, and to be formed into a Birth, that New Substantial Birth, that's brought forth in the Soul, naturally feeds upon, and is nourished by this Spiritual Body: Yea, as this outward Birth lives not, but as it sucks in Breath by the Outward Elementary Air; so this New Birth lives not in the Soul, but as it draws in and breathes by that Spiritual Air or Vehicle: And as the Outward Birth cannot subsist without some Outward Body to feed upon, some Outward Flesh, and some outward Drink; so neither can this Inward Birth, without it be fed by this Inward Body, by this Inward Flesh and Blood of Christ, which answers to it after the same manner, by way of *Analogy*. And this is most agreeable to the Doctrine of Christ concerning this matter. For as without Outward Food the Natural Body hath not Life; so also saith Christ, Joh. 6. 53. *Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you: And as the Outward body eating Outward food, lives thereby; so Christ saith, That he that eateth him, shall live by him.* So it is this Inward Participation of this Inward Man, of this Inward and Spiritual Body, by which Man is united to God, and has Fellowship and Communion with him.

He,

He that eateth my Flesh, and drinketh my Joh. 6. 56.
Blood (saith Christ) dwelleth in me, and I
in him; this cannot be understood of Out-
ward Eating of Outward Bread: And as
by this the Soul must have Fellowship
with God, so also in so far as all the Saints
are Partakers of this One Body, and this
One Blood, they come also to have a
Joint-Communion. Hence the Apostle
1 Cor. 10. 17. in this respect saith, That
they being many, are One Bread, and One
Body: And to the Wise among the Corin-
thians he saith, The Bread, which we break, Ver. 16.
is the Communion of the Body of Christ.
 This is the True and Spiritual Supper of The True
 the Lord, which Men come to partake of Spiritual
 by hearing the Voice of Christ, and open- Supper of
 ing the Door of their Hearts, and so let- the Lord.
 ting him in, in the manner above-said, ac-
 cording to the plain words of the Scripture;
Rev. 3. 20. Behold, I stand at the Door and
Knock; if any Man hear my Voice, and open
the Door, I will come in to him, and will sup
with him, and he with me. So that the
 Supper of the Lord, and the Supping with
 the Lord, and partaking of his Flesh and
 Blood, is no ways limited to the Ceremo-
 ny of breaking Bread and drinking Wine
 at particular times; but is truly and really
 Enjoyed, as often as the Soul retires into

the Light of the Lord, and feels and partakes of that Heavenly Life, by which the Inward Man is nourished: Which may be, and is often witnessed by the Faithful at all times; though more particularly, when they are Assembled together to Wait upon the Lord.

§ IV. But what Confusion the Professors of Christianity have run into concerning this matter, is more than obvious; who (as in most other things they have done) for want of a true Spiritual Understanding, have sought to Tie this Supper of the Lord to that Ceremony (used by Christ before his Death) of breaking Bread and drinking Wine with his Disciples. And though they for the most part agree in this general, yet how do they Contend and Debate one against another? How strangely are they pinched, pained, and straitned to make this Spiritual Mystery agree to that Ceremony? And what monstrous and wild Opinions and Conceivingings have they invented, to inclose or affix the Body of Christ to their Bread and Wine? From which Opinion not only the greatest, and fiercest, and most hurtful Contests, both among the Professors of Christianity in general, and among Protestants in particular, have arisen; but also

Man is not tied to the Ceremony of breaking Bread and drinking Wine, which Christ did use with his Disciples; This only was a Shadow.

such

such Absurdities, irrational and blasphemous Consequences have ensued, as make the Christian Religion odious and hateful to Jews, Turks and Heathens. The Professors of Christianity do chiefly divide in this matter into three Opinions.

What makes the Christian Religion hateful to Jews, Turks and Heathens?

The first is of those that say, The Substance of the Bread is Transubstantiated into the very Substance of that same Body, Flesh and Blood of Christ, which was born of the Virgin Mary, and crucified by the Jews: So that after the Words of Consecration (as they call them) it is no more Bread, but the Body of Christ.

The Papists Faith of Christ his Flesh and Blood

The second is of such as say; The Substance of the Bread remains; but that also that Body is in, and with, and under the Bread: So that both the Substance of the Bread, and the Body, Flesh and Blood of Christ, is there also.

The Lutherans Faith.

The third is of those, that (denying both these) do affirm, That the Body of Christ is not there Corporally, or Substantially; but yet that it is Really and Sacramentally received by the Faithful, in the use of Bread and Wine: But how, or what way it's there, they know not, nor can they tell; only we must believe it is there, yet so, that it is only properly in Heaven.

The Catholics Faith.

It is not my Design to enter into a Resu-

tation of these several Opinions, for each of their Authors and Assertors have sufficiently Refuted one another; and are all of them no less strong both from Scripture and Reason, in Refuting each their contrary Party's Opinion, than they are Weak in Establishing their own. For I often have seriously observed in reading their respective Writings (and so it may be have others) that all of them do notably, in so far as they Refute the contrary Opinions; but that they are mightily pained, when they come to Confirm and Plead for their own: Hence I necessarily must conclude, That none of them had attained to the Truth and Substance of this Mystery. Let us see, if Calvin, after he hath Refuted the two former Opinions, be more successful, in what he affirms and asserts for the Truth of his Opinion; who, after he hath much laboured in overturning and Refuting the two former Opinions, plainly confesseth, that he *knows not, what to affirm instead of them.* For after he has spoken much, and at last Concluded, *That the Body of Christ is there, and that the Saints must needs partake thereof;* at last he lands in these Words. (*Sect. 32.*) *But if it be asked me, how it is? I shall not be ashamed to confess, That it is a Secret, too high*

For

Inst. lib. 4.
cap 17.

F Calvin's
Faith of
Christ his
Flesh and
Blood Un-
certain.

for me to comprehend in my Spirit, or explain in Words. Here he deals very ingeniously; and yet who would have thought, that such a Man would have been brought to this Strait in the Confirming of his Opinion? Considering but a little before, in the same Chapter (*Seet. 15.*) he accuseth the Schoolmen among the *Papists*, (and I Confess truly) *In that they neither* The like the *Papists*. *Understand, nor Explain to others, how Christ is in the Eucharist*; which shortly after he Confesseth himself, he cannot do. If then the School-men among the *Papists* do neither Understand, nor yet can Explain to others their Doctrine in this matter, nor *Calvin* can comprehend it in his Spirit, (which I judge is as much, as not to understand it) nor Express it in Words (and then surely he cannot Explain it to others) then no certainty is to be had from either of them. There have been great Endeavours used for Reconcilement in this matter, both betwixt *Papists* and *Lutherans*, *Lutherans* and *Calvinists*, yea, and *Calvinists* and *Papists*, but all to no purpose: and many Forms and Manners of Expressions drawn up, to which all might yield; which in the end proved in vain, seeing every one understood them, and interpreted them, their own way: and so they

they did thereby but Equivocate and Deceive one another. The Reason of all this Contention is, because they all wanted a clear Understanding of the Mystery, and were doting about the Shadow and the Externals. For both the Ground and Matter of their Contest lies in things extrinſick from, and unnecessary to the main Matter; and this hath been often the Policy of Satan to busie People, and amuse them with outward Signs, Shadows and Forms, making them Contend about that; while in the mean time the Substance is neglected. Yea, and in Contending for these Shadows, he stirs them up to the practice of Malice, Heat, Revenge and other Vices, by which he establisheth his Kingdom of Darknes among them, and ruines the Life of Christianity: For there has been more Animosity and Heat about this one Particular, and more Blood-shed and Contention, than about any other. And surely, they are little acquainted with the State of Protestants Affairs, who know not, that their Contentions about this have been more hurtful to the Reformation, than all the Opposition they met with from their common Adversaries. Now all these uncertain and absurd Opinions, and the Contentions therefrom arising, have

Satan busies people in outward Signs, Shadows and Forms, whilst they neglect the Substance.

What hath been hurtful to the Reformation.

proceeded from their all agreeing in Two General Errors concerning this thing: Which being denied and receded from, as they are by us, there would be an Easie Way made for Reconciliation, and we should all meet in the one Spiritual and true Understanding of this Mystery; and as the Contentions, so would also the Absurdities, which follow from all the Three forementioned Opinions, Cease and fall to the ground.

The *First* of these *Errors* is, in making the Communion or Participation of the Body, Flesh and Blood of Christ to relate to that outward Body, Vessel or Temple, that was born of the Virgin *Mary*, and walked and suffered in *Judea*; whereas it should relate to the Spiritual Body, Flesh and Blood of Christ, even that Heavenly and Celestial Light and Life, which was the Food and Nourishment of the Regenerate in all Ages, as we have already proved.

Two Errors the ground of the Contentions about the Supper.

The *Second Error* is, In tying this Participation of the Body and Blood of Christ to that Ceremony, used by him with his Disciples in the breaking of bread, &c. as if it had only a Relation thereto, or were only enjoyed in the use of that Ceremony; which it neither hath, nor is. For this is

that Bread, which Christ in his Prayer teaches to call for, terming it *ἄρτον ἡμῶν*, i. e. the supersubstantial Bread, as the *Greek* hath it; and which the Soul partakes of, without any relation or necessary respect to this Ceremony, as shall be hereafter proved more at length.

Believers
Souls do
really feed
upon the
Flesh and
Blood of
Christ.

These *Two Errors* being thus laid aside, and the Contentions arising therefrom buried, all are agreed in the main Positions, viz. *First*, That the body, flesh and blood of Christ is necessary for the nourishing of the Soul; *Secondly*, That the Souls of Believers do really and truly partake and feed upon the body, flesh and blood of Christ. But while Men are not content with the Spirituality of this Mystery, going in their own Wills, and according to their own Inventions, to strain and wrest the Scriptures, for to tie this Spiritual Communion of the flesh and blood of Christ, to outward Bread and Wine, and such like Carnal Ordinances, no wonder, if by their carnal Apprehensions they run into Heaps and Confusion. But because it hath been generally supposed, that the Communion of the Body and Blood of Christ had some special relation to the Ceremony of breaking Bread, I shall first Refute that Opinion, and then proceed to consider the Na-

ture and Use of that Ceremony, and whether it be now necessary to Continues; answering the Reasons and Objections of such as plead its Continuance, as a necessary and standing Ordinance of Jesus Christ.

§ V. First, It must be understood, that I speak of a Necessary and Peculiar Relation, otherwise than in a general Respect: For, forasmuch as our Communion with Christ is, and ought to be, our greatest and chiefest Work, we ought to do all other things with a Respect to God, and our Fellowship with him; but a special and necessary Respect or Relation is such, as where the two things are tied and united together, either of their own Nature, or by the Command of God, that the one cannot be enjoyed, or at least is not (except very extraordinarily) without the other. Thus Salvation hath a necessary respect to Holiness, because without Holiness no Man shall see God: And the Eating of the flesh and blood of Christ hath a necessary respect to our having Life, because if we eat not his flesh, and drink not his blood, we cannot have Life: And our Feeling of God's Presence hath a necessary respect to our being found Meeting in his Name, by Divine Precept, because he has promised, Where two or three are Met together in his Name,

I. That the Communion of the Body and Blood of Christ has no special Relation to the Ceremony of breaking Bread, neither by Nature, nor Precept.

Name, he will be in the midst of them: In like manner our receiving benefits and blessings from God, has a necessary respect to our Praying, because if we Ask, he hath promised we shall Receive. Now the Communion or Participation of the flesh and blood of Christ hath no such necessary relation to the breaking of Bread and drinking of Wine; for if it had any such necessary relation, it would either be from the Nature of the Thing, or from some Divine Precept: But we shall shew, it is from neither; Therefore, &c. First, It is not from the Nature of it, because to partake of the flesh and blood of Christ is a Spiritual Exercise; and all confess, that it is by the Soul and Spirit, that we become real Partakers of it, as it is the Soul, and not the Body, that is nourished by it: but to eat Bread and drink Wine, is a natural Act, which in it self adds nothing to the Soul, neither has any thing, that is Spiritual, in it; because the most carnal Man that is, can as fully, as perfectly and as wholly eat Bread and drink Wine, as the most Spiritual. Secondly, Their relation is not by Nature, else they would infer one another: but all acknowledge, that many eat of the Bread, and drink of the Wine, even that which, they say, is Consecrate and

Transubstantiate into the very Body of Christ,
 who notwithstanding have not *Life Eter-*
nal, have not Christ dwelling in them, nor
 do live by him, as all do, who truly par-
 take of the *Flesh and Blood of Christ,*
 without the Use of this Ceremony; as all the
Patriarchs and Prophets did, before this
Ordinance (as they account it) was In-
 stituted. Neither was there any thing
 under the *Law*, that had any direct or
 necessary Relation hereunto; though to
 partake of the *Flesh and Blood of Christ* in
 all Ages was indispensibly necessary to
 Salvation. For as for the *Paschal Lamb*,
 the whole End of it is signified particular-
 ly *Exod. 13. 8, 9.* to wit, that the Jews
 might thereby be kept in remembrance of their
 deliverance out of Egypt. Secondly, It has
 no relation by *Divine Precept*; for if it
 had, it would be mentioned in that,
 which our *Adversaries* account the *Insti-*
tution of it, or else in the *Practice* of it
 by the *Saints* recorded in *Scripture*: But
 so it is not. For as to the *Institution*, or
 rather *Narration* of *Christ's Practice* in this
 matter, we have it recorded by the Evan-
 gelists *Matthew, Mark and Luke.* In the
 first two there is only an Account of the
 matter of Fact, to wit, That Christ brake
 Bread, and gave it his Disciples to eat, say-

The Patri-
 archs and
 Prophets
 without
 this Cere-
 mony's Use
 were true
 Partakers
 of Christ's
 Flesh and
 Blood.

The Pa-
 schal Lamb
 its End.

Matth. 26.

26.

Mark 14. *ing, This is my Body; and blessing the Cup,*
 22. *he gave it them to drink, saying, This is my*
 Luke 22. *Blood; but nothing of any desire to them*
 19. *to do it. In the last, after the Bread*
 The *Institution of* *(but before the Blessing or giving them*
the Supper, *the Wine): he bids them do it in Remem-*
 or *Narra-* *brance of him: What we are to think of*
tation of *this Practice of Christ, shall be spoken of*
Christ's *hereafter. But what necessary Relation*
Practice *hath all this to the Believers partaking of*
therein. *the Flesh and Blood of Christ? The End*
of this, for which they were to do it (if
at all) is to Remember Christ; which the
Apostle yet more particularly expresses,
1 Cor. 11. 26. To shew forth the Lord's
Death: But to Remember the Lord, or De-
clare his Death, which are the special and
particular Ends annexed to the Use of this
Ceremony, is not at all to partake of the
Flesh and Blood of Christ, neither have
they any more necessary Relation to it,
than any other two different Spiritual Du-
ties. For though they, that partake of
the Flesh and Blood of Christ, cannot but
Remember him; yet the Lord and his Death
may be Remembered (as none can deny)
where his Flesh and Blood is not truly par-
taken of. So that, since the very parti-
cular and express End of this Ceremony
may be witnessed (to wit, the Remem-
brance

brance of the Lord's Death) and yet the *Flesh and Blood of Christ* not partaken of, it cannot have had any necessary Relation to it, else the partaking thereof would have been the End of it, and could not have been attained without this Participation. But on the contrary we may well infer hence, that since the positive End of this Ceremony is not the partaking of the *Flesh and Blood of Christ*, and that whoever partakes of the *Flesh and Blood of Christ*, cannot but Remember him; that therefore such need not this Ceremony to put them in Remembrance of him.

But if it be said, That *Jesus Christ* calls the Bread here his Body, and the Wine his Blood; therefore he seems to have had a special relation to his Disciples partaking of his *Flesh and Blood* in the use of this thing.

I Answer; His calling the Bread his Body, and the Wine his Blood, would yet infer no such thing: Though it is not denied, but that *Jesus Christ* in all things he did, yea and from the use of all Natural things, took occasion to raise the Minds of his Disciples and Hearers to Spirituals. Hence from the Woman of Samaria her drawing Water, he took occasion to tell her of that Living Water, which whoso drinketh thereof, shall never thirst; which

Object.

Answ.

The woman of Samaria.
Joh. 4. 14.

which indeed is all one with his Blood here spoken of: Yet it will not follow, that that *Well*, or *Water*, had any necessary relation to the *Living Water*, or the *Living Water* to it, &c. So Christ takes occasion from the *Jews following him for the Loaves*, to tell them of this *Spiritual Bread and Flesh of his Body*, which was more necessary for them to feed upon; it will not therefore follow, that their following him for the *Loaves* had any necessary relation thereunto. So also Christ here being at *Supper* with his *Disciples*, takes occasion from the *Bread and Wine*, which was before them, to signifie unto them, that as *That Bread*, which he brake unto them, and *That Wine*, which he blessed and gave unto them, did contribute to the preserving and nourishing of their Bodies; so was he also to give his Body, and shed his Blood for the Salvation of their Souls: And therefore the very End proposed in this Ceremony, to those that observe it, is to be a Memorial of his Death.

But if it be said, that the Apostle 1 Cor. 10. 16. Calls the Bread which he brake, the Communion of the Body of Christ, and the Cup, the Communion of his Blood.

I do most willingly subscribe unto it; but

but do deny, that this is understood of the *outward Bread*, neither can it be evinced, but the Contrary is manifest from the *Context*: For the Apostle in this *Chapter* speaks not one Word of that *Ceremony*. For having in the beginning of it shewn them, how the *Jews of Old* were made *partakers* of the *Spiritual Food and Water*, which was *Christ*, and how several of them, through *Disobedience* and *Idolatry* fell from that good Condition, he exhorts them by the *Example* of those *Jews*, whom God destroyed of Old, to *flee those Evils*; shewing them, that they (to wit, the *Corinthians*) are likewise *partakers* of the *body and blood of Christ*, of which *Communion* they would rob themselves, if they did *Evil*, because they could not *drink of the Cup of the Lord*, and the *Cup of Devils*, and *partake of the Lord's Table*, and of the *Table of Devils*, ver. 21. Which shews, that he understands not here the using of *outward Bread and Wine*; because those, that do *Drink the Cup of Devils*, and *Eat of the Table of Devils*, (yea, the *Wickedest* of Men) may *partake* of the *outward Bread and outward Wine*. For there the Apostle calls the *bread One*, ver. 17. and he saith, *We being many, are One bread and one body*; for

The *wickedest* may take the *outward Bread and Wine*.

we are all partakers of that One bread: Now if the *bread* be *One*, it cannot be the *Outward*, or the *Inward* would be excluded; whereas it cannot be denied, but that it's the partaking of the *Inward bread*, and not the *Outward*, that makes the *Saints* truly *One body* and *One bread*. And

The Sacramental Union pretended, is a *Figment*.

whereas they say, that the *One bread* here comprehendeth both the *Outward* and *Inward* by virtue of the *Sacramental Union*; that indeed is to affirm, but not to prove. As for that *Figment* of a *Sacramental Union*, I find not such a thing in all the *Scripture*, especially in the *New Testament*: Nor is there any thing can give a rise for such a thing in this *Chapter*, where the *Apostle*, as is above observed, is not at all treating of that *Ceremony*; but only from the *Excellency* of that *Priviledge*, which the *Corinthians* had, as believing *Christians*, *To partake of the flesh and blood of Christ*, dehorts them from *Idolatry*, and *partaking* of the *Sacrifices* offered to *Idols*, so as thereby to offend or hurt their *weak Brethren*.

Object. But that, which they most of all Cry out for in this matter, and are always *Noising*, is from *1 Cor. 11.* where the *Apostle* is particularly treating of this matter; and therefore from some Words here they

they have the greatest *Appearance* of Truth for their *Affertion*: As *ver. 27.* where he calls the *Cup, the Cup of the Lord*, and saith; *That they who eat of it, and drink it unworthily, are guilty of the body and blood of the Lord*, and *ver. 28.* *Eat and drink their own Damnation*: intimating hence, that this hath an immediate or necessary relation to the *body, flesh and blood of Christ.*

Though this at first View may catch *Ans.* the *Unwary Reader*; yet being well considered, it doth no ways Evince the matter in *Controversie*. As for the *Corinthians* being in the *Use* of this Ceremony, why they were so, and how that *obliges* not *Christians* now to the same, shall be spoken of hereafter: it suffices at this time to consider, that they were in the *Use* of it. *Secondly*, That in the *Use* of it they were guilty of, and committed divers *Abuses*. *Thirdly*: That the Apostle here is giving them Directions, how they may do it aright, in shewing them the *right and proper Use and End* of it.

These things being premised, let it be observed, that the very *express* and *particular Use* of it, according to the Apostle is, *To shew forth the Lord's Death, &c.* But to shew forth the *Lord's Death*, and

partake of the flesh and blood of Christ, are different things: He saith not, *As often as ye eat this Bread, and drink this Cup, ye partake of the Body and Blood of Christ; but, To shew forth the Lord's Death.* So I acknowledge, that *this Ceremony*, by those that practise it, hath an *Immediate Relation* to the outward Body and Death of Christ upon the Cross, as being properly a *Memorial* of it; but it doth not thence follow, that it hath any inward or *immediate Relation* to Believers communicating or partaking of the *Spiritual Body and Blood of Christ*, or that *Spiritual Supper*, spoken of *Rev. 3. 20.* For though in a general way, as every *Religious Action* in some respect hath a common relation to the *Spiritual Communion* of the *Saints with God*; so we shall not deny, but this hath a relation to others. Now for his calling the *Cup*, the *Cup of the Lord*, and saying, *They are guilty of the Body and Blood of Christ, and eat their own Damnation, in not discerning the Lord's Body, &c.* I answer, that this infers no more *Necessary Relation*, than any other *Religious Act*; and amounts to no more than this, that since the *Corinthians* were in the *Use* of this Ceremony, and so performed it as a *Religious Act*, they ought

Christ's
Act of
bread and
wine is not
a thing
itself

to do it *Worthily*; else they should bring *Condemnation* upon themselves. Now, this will not more infer the thing so practised by them, to be a *necessary, Religious Act*, obligatory upon others, than when *Rom. 14. 6.* the Apostle saith, *He that regardeth the Day, regardeth it unto the Lord*, it can be thence inferred, that the *Days* that some *esteemed* and *observed*, did lay an obligation upon others to do the same. But yet, as he that *Esteemed a Day*, and placed Conscience in keeping it, was to regard it to the *Lord*, and so it was to him, in so far as he dedicated it unto the *Lord*, the *Lord's Day*, he was to do it *Worthily*; and if he did it *Unworthily*, he would be guilty of the *Lord's Day*, and so keep it to his own *Damnation*: So also such as observe this *Ceremony of Bread and Wine*, it is to them the *Bread of the Lord*, and the *Cup of the Lord*, because they *Use* it as a *Religious Act*: And forasmuch as their *End* therein is, *To shew forth the Lord's Death*, and to *Remember his Body*, that was *Crucified* for them, and his *Blood*, that was *shed* for them; If notwithstanding they believe it is their *Duty* to do it, and make it a matter of *Conscience* to forbear, if they do it without that due *Preparation* and *Exami-*

The Pharisees guilty of the Blood of the Prophets.

nation, which every Religious Act ought to be performed in, then instead of truly Remembering the Lord's Death, and his Body and his Blood, they render themselves Guilty of it, as being in one Spirit with those, that Crucified him, and shed his Blood, though pretending with Thanksgiving and Joy to Remember it. Thus the Scribes and Pharisees of Old, though in Memory of the Prophets they garnished their Sepulchres, yet are said by Christ to be Guilty of their Blood. And that no more can be hence inferred, appears from another saying of the same Apostle, Rom. 14. 23. *He that doubteth, is damned, if he eat, &c.* where he, speaking of those that judged it unlawful to Eat flesh, &c. saith, *If they eat doubting, they eat their own Damnation.* Now it is manifest for all this, that either the doing or forbearing of this, was to another, that placed no Conscience in it, of no moment; so I say, he that Eateth that, which in his Conscience he is perswaded is not lawful for him to Eat, doth Eat his own Damnation: So he also, that placeth Conscience in Eating bread and wine, as a Religious Act, if he do it Unprepared, and without that due respect, wherein such Acts should be gone about, he Eateth and Drinketh his own Damnation,

not discerning the Lord's Body, i. e. not minding what he doth, to wit, with a special Respect to the Lord, and by way of a special Commemoration of the Death of Christ.

§ VI. I having now sufficiently shewn, what the *True Communion* of the Body and Blood of Christ is, how it is *partaken* of, and how it has no *necessary Relation* to that Ceremony of *bread and Wine* used by Christ with his Disciples; it is fit now to consider the *Nature and Constitution* of that Ceremony (for as to the *proper Use* of it, we have had occasion to speak before) Whether it be a *standing Ordinance* in the Church of Christ, obligatory upon all; or indeed, whether it be any *necessary part* of the *Worship* of the *New Covenant-Dispensation*, or hath any *better or more binding Foundation*, than several other Ceremonies appointed and practised about the same time, which the most of our Opposers acknowledge to be *ceased*, and now no ways *binding upon Christians*? We find this Ceremony only mentioned in Scripture in four places, to wit, *Matthew, Mark and Luke*, and by *Paul* to the *Corinthians*: If any would infer any thing from the frequency of the mentioning of it, that will add nothing; for it being a *matter of Fact*, is

II.

Whether this Ceremony be a necessary Part of the New Covenant, and Obligatory?

Mat. 26.
26.
Mark 14.
22.
Luke 22.
19.
1 Cor. 11.
23.

therefore mentioned by the *Evangelists*: And there are other things less *Memorable* as often, yea oftner mentioned. *Matthew* and *Mark* give only an *Account* of the *Matter of Fact*, without any *Precept* to do so afterwards; simply declaring, that *Jesus* at that time did desire them to *Eat* of the *Bread*, and *Drink* of the *Cup*: To which *Luke* adds these Words; *This do in Remembrance of me*. If we consider this *Action of Christ* with his *Apostles*, there will appear nothing singular in it, for a *Foundation* to such a *strange Superstructure*, as many in their *Airy Imaginations* have sought to build upon it; for both *Matthew* and *Mark* press it as an *Act* done by him, as he was *Eating*: *Matthew* saith, *And as they were Eating*; and *Mark*, *And as they did Eat, Jesus took bread, &c.*

The bread-
ing of
Bread was
no singular
thing, but
a Custom
to Jews.
P. Riccius.

Now this *Act* was no singular thing, neither any *solemn Institution* of a *Gospel Ordinance*, because it was a *Constant Custom* among the *Jews* (as *Paulus Riccius* observes at length in his *Celestial Agriculture*); That when they did *Eat* the *Pass-over*, the *Master* of the *Family* did *take Bread*, and *bless* it, and *breaking* gave of it to the rest; and likewise *taking Wine*, did the same: So that there can nothing further appear in this, than that *Jesus Christ*,

who fulfilled all Righteousness, and also observed the Jewish Feasts and Customs, used this also among his Disciples only, that, as in most other things he laboured to draw their Minds to a further thing; so in the use of this he takes occasion to put them in mind of his Death and Sufferings, which were shortly to be: Which he did the oftner Inculcate unto them, for that they were Averse from believing it. And as for that Expression of Luke, *Do this in Remembrance of me*; it will amount to no more, than being the last time, that Christ did Eat with his Disciples, he desired them, that in their Eating and Drinking they might have regard to him; and by the Remembring of that opportunity, be the more stirred up to follow him diligently through Sufferings and Death, &c. But what man of Reason, laying aside the Prejudice of Education, and the Influence of Tradition, will say, that this Account of the Matter of Fact given by Matthew and Mark, or this Expression of Luke, to do that in Remembrance of him, will amount to these Consequences, which the generality of Christians have sought to draw from it; as calling it *Augustissimum Eucharistiae Sacramentum*; *Venerabile Altaris Sacramentum*, The Principal Seat of the Covenant of

What it is,
To do this
in Remem-
brance of
Christ.

Mat. 26.

26.

Mark 14.

22.

Luke 22.

19.

1 Cor. 11.

23.

therefore mentioned by the *Evangelists*: And there are other things less *Memorable* as often, yea oftner mentioned. *Matthew* and *Mark* give only an Account of the *Matter of Fact*, without any *Precept* to do so afterwards; simply declaring, that *Jesus* at that time did desire them to *Eat* of the *Bread*, and *Drink* of the *Cup*: To which *Luke* adds these Words; *This do in Remembrance of me*. If we consider this *Action* of *Christ* with his *Apostles*, there will appear nothing singular in it, for a *Foundation* to such a *strange Superstructure*, as many in their *Airy Imaginations* have sought to build upon it; for both *Matthew* and *Mark* press it as an *Act* done by him, as he was *Eating*: *Matthew* saith, *And as they were Eating*; and *Mark*, *And as they did Eat*, *Jesus* took bread, &c.

The breaking of Bread was no singular thing, but a Custom to Jews.

P. Riccius.

Now this *Act* was no singular thing, neither any *solemn Institution* of a *Gospel Ordinance*, because it was a *Constant Custom* among the *Jews* (as *Paulus Riccius* observes at length in his *Celestial Agriculture*); That when they did *Eat* the *Pass-over*, the *Master* of the *Family* did take *Bread*, and bless it, and breaking gave of it to the rest; and likewise taking *Wine*, did the same: So that there can nothing further appear in this, than that *Jesus Christ*,

who

who fulfilled all Righteousness, and also observed the Jewish Feasts and Customs, used this also among his Disciples only, that, as in most other things he laboured to draw their Minds to a *further thing*; so in the use of this he takes occasion to put them in mind of his *Death and Sufferings*, which were shortly to be: Which he did the oftner *Inculcate* unto them, for that they were *Averse* from believing it. And

as for that Expression of Luke, *Do this in Remembrance of me*; it will amount to no more, than being the *last time*, that Christ did Eat with his Disciples, he desired them, that in their *Eating and Drinking* they might have regard to him; and by the *Remembring* of that opportunity, be the more stirred up to *follow him diligently* through *Sufferings and Death*, &c. But what man of Reason, laying aside the Prejudice of *Education*, and the Influence of *Tradition*, will say, that this Account of the *Matter of Fact* given by Matthew and Mark, or this Expression of Luke, to do that in Remembrance of him, will amount to these Consequences, which the generality of Christians have sought to draw from it; as calling it *Augustissimum Eucharistiae Sacramentum*; *Venerabile Altaris Sacramentum*, The Principal Seat of the Covenant of

What it is,
To do this
in Remem-
brance of
Christ.

Grace,

Grace, by which all the Benefits of Christ's Death are sealed to Believers, and such like things? But to give a further Evidence, how these Consequences have not any bottom from the Practice of that Ceremony, nor from the words following, *Do this, &c.* let us consider another of the like Nature, as it is at length expressed by *John*, c. 13, v. 3, 4, 8, 13, 14, 15. *Jesus riseth from Supper, and laid aside his Garments, and took a Towel, and girded himself: After that he poured Water into a Basin, and began to Wash the Disciples Feet, and to wipe them with the Towel, wherewith he was girded. Peter saith unto him, Thou shalt never Wash my Feet: Jesus answered him, If I Wash thee not, thou hast no part with me. So after he had Washed their Feet, he said, Know ye, what I have done to you? If I then your Lord and Master have Washed your Feet, ye also ought to Wash one anothers Feet: For I have given you an Example, that ye should do, as I have done to you.* As to which let it be observed, that *John* relates this Passage to have been done at the same time, with the other of breaking Bread, both being done the Night of the Pass-over, after Supper. If we regard the Narration of this, and the Circumstances attending it, it was done with far

Christ's
Washing of
Feet, and
its Manner
related.

far more Solemnity, and prescribed far more punctually and particularly, than the former. It is said only, *As he was Eating, he took Bread*; so that this would seem to be but an Occasional business: But here he rose up, he laid by his Garments, he girded himself, he poured out the Water, he Washed their Feet, he wiped them with the Towel; He did this to all of them: Which are Circumstances surely far more observable, than those noted in the other. The former was a Practice common among the Jews, used by all Masters of Families upon that occasion; but this, as to the Manner and Person acting it, to wit, for the Master to rise up, and Wash the Feet of his Servants and Disciples, was more singular and observable. In the breaking of Bread, and giving of Wine, it is not pleaded by our Adversaries, nor yet mentioned in the Text, that he particularly put them into the hands of all; but breaking it, and blessing it, gave it the nearest, and so they from hand to hand: But here it is mentioned, that he Washed not the Feet of one or two, but of many. He saith not in the former, that if they do not eat of that Bread, and drink of that Wine, they shall be prejudiced by it; but here he saith expressly to Peter, that if he Wash

Compar'd
with the
Breaking
of Bread.

not

not him, he hath no part with him: Which being spoken upon *Peter's* Refusing to let him Wash his Feet, would seem to Import no less, than not the Continuance only, but even the Necessity of this Ceremony. In the former he saith, as it were passingly, *Do this in Remembrance of me*; but here he sitteth down: Again, he desires them to consider what he hath done; tells them positively, *that as he hath done to them, so ought they to do to one another*: And yet again, he redoubles that Precept, by telling them, *he has given them an Example, that they should do so likewise*. If we respect the Nature of the thing, it hath as much in it, as either Baptism or the breaking of Bread, seeing it is an outward Element of a cleansing Nature, applied to the outward Man, by the Command and the Example of Christ, to signifie an inward purifying. I would willingly propose this seriously to Men that will be pleased to make use of that Reason and Understanding that God hath given them, and not be imposed upon, nor abused by the Custom or Tradition of others, Whether this Ceremony, if we respect either the Time, that it was Appointed in, or the Circumstances, wherewith it was performed. or the Command enjoin-

ing.

The Wash-
ing one &
not others
Feet was
left, as an
Example.

ing the use of it, hath not as much to recommend it for a standing Ordinance of the Gospel, as either Water-Baptism, or Bread and Wine, or any other of that kind? I wonder then what Reason the *Papist* can give, why they have not numbred it among their *Sacraments*, except meerly *Voluntas Ecclesiae & Traditio Patrum*.

But if they say, *That it is used among them, in that the Pope and some other Persons among them, use to do it Once a year to some poor People.* Object.

I would willingly know what Reason they have, why This should not be extended to *All*, as well as that of the *Eucharist*, (as they term it;) or whence it appears from the Text, that [*Do this in remembrance of me*] should be interpreted, - that the Bread and Wine were every day to be taken by all *Priests*, or the Bread every day, or every week by the *People*; and that that other Command of Christ, *Ye ought to do as I have done to you, &c.* is only to be understood of the *Pope* or some other Persons, to be done only to a *few*, and that *once a year*? Surely, there can be no other Reason for this difference assigned from the Text. And as to *Protestants*, who use not this Ceremony at all, if they will but open their eyes, they may see how that by *Ceremonies* Answ.

The *Protestants* use not *Washing of feet*.

from and Tradition they are abused in this matter, as were their *Fathers* in divers *Papist* Traditions. For if we look into the plain Scripture, what can be thence inferred to urge the One, which may not be likewise pleaded for the Other? Or for laying aside the One, which may not be likewise said against the Continuance of the Other? If they say, *That the former, of Washing the Feet, was only a Ceremony*; What have they, whence they can shew, that this breaking of bread is more? If they say, *That the former was only a Sign of Humility and Purifying*, What have they to prove that this was more? If they say, *The one was only for a Time, and was no Evangelical Ordinance*: What hath this to make it such, that the other wanted? Surely there is no way of Reason to evite this, neither can any thing be alledged that the one should Cease, and not the other; or the one Continue, and not the other, but the meer Opinion of the Affirmers, which by Custom, Education and Tradition, hath begotten in the hearts of People a greater Reverence for, and Esteem of the one, than the other: Which, if it had fall'n out to be as much recommended to us by Tradition, would, no doubt, have been as tenaciously pleaded for, as having no less Foundation in the Scri-

Scri-

Scripture. But since the former, to wit, the *Washing of one anothers Feet*, is justly laid aside, as *not binding upon Christians*, so ought also the other, for the same Reason.

§. VII. But I strange that those that are so Clamorous for this Ceremony, and stick so much to it, take liberty to dispense with the *Manner or Method* that Christ did it in; since none, that ever I could hear of, who now do it, use it in the same way that he did it: Christ did it at Supper, while they were eating; but they do it in the Morning only by itself: What Rule walk they by in this Change?

The breaking of Bread not used now in the same manner as Christ did.

If it be said, *These are but Circumstances, Object. and not the Matter; and if the Matter be kept to, the alteration of Circumstances is but of small moment.*

What if it should be said, the *Whole* is but a *Circumstance* which fell out at that time when Christ did *Eat the Pass-over*? For if we have regard to that, which alone can be pleaded for an *Institution*, viz. these Words, *Do this in remembrance of me*; it doth as properly relate to the *Manner*, as *Matter*. For how may or can they evince in Reason, that these Words, *Do this*, only signifie, *Eat Bread, and drink Wine*, but it is no matter *when ye eat, nor how*

Answ.

how ye eat it ; and not, as ye have seen me eat at Supper with you, who take Bread and break it, and give it you ; and take the Cup, and bless it, and give it you, so do ye likewise ? And seeing Christ makes no distinction in those Words, *Do this*, it cannot be judged in Reason but to relate to the whole : Which if it do, all those that at present use this Ceremony among Christians, have not yet obeyed this Precept, nor fulfilled this Institution, notwithstanding all their Clamours concerning it,

Object. If it be said, *That the Time and Manner of doing it by Christ, was but Accidentally, as being after the Jewish Passover: which was at Supper.*

Ans. Besides that it may be answered and easily proved, *That the whole was Accidental*, as being the Practice of a Jewish Ceremony, as is above observed ; May it not the same way be urged, that the *Drinking of Wine* was Accidental, as being the Natural Product of that Country ? and so be pleaded, that in those Countries where Wine doth not grow, as in our Nation of Scotland, we may make use of Beer, or Ale, in the use of this Ceremony, or Bread made of other Grain than that which Christ used ? And yet would not our Adversaries judge this an Abuse, and not right performing of this

The bread-
king of
Bread was
a Jewish
Ceremony.

this Sacrament? Yea, have not *Scruples* of this kind occasioned no little Contention among the *Professors of Christianity*? What great Contest and Strife hath been betwixt the *Greek* and *Latin Churches* concerning the *Bread*? While the one will have it *Unleavened*, reckoning, because the Jews made use of *Unleavened Bread* in the *Passover*, that it was such kind of *Bread* that Christ did break to his Disciples; the other *Leavened*: Therefore the *Lutherans* make use of *Unleavened Bread*, the *Calvinists* of *Leavened*: And this Contest was so hot, when the *Reformation* was beginning at *Geneva*, that *Calvin* and *Farcellus* were forced to flee for it. But do not *Protestants* by these *Uncertainties* open a Door to *Papists* for their excluding the *People* from the *Cup*? Will not [*Do this*] infer positively, that they should do in the same Manner, and at the same Time, which Christ did it, as well as that they should use the *Cup*, and not the *Bread* only? Or what reason have they to dispense with the One, more than the *Papists* have to do with the Other? O what strange Absurdities and Inconveniencies have Christians brought upon themselves, by superstitiously adhering to this Ceremony! Out of which Difficulties it is impossible for them to extricate themselves, but

The Cler-
gy Taking
Bread, do
bless and
give it; the
Laiety must
Take and
Eat, not
Bless it.

but by laying it aside, as they have done others of the like Nature. For besides what is above-mentioned, I would gladly know, how from the words they can be certainly Resolved, that these words [*Do this*] must be understood to the Clergy, *Take, bless and break this Bread, and give it to others;* but to the Laiety only, *Take and eat, but do not bless?* &c.

Object. If it be said, *That the Clergy was only present.*

Ans. Then will not that open a Door for the Popish Argument against the Administration of the Cup to the People? Or may not another from thence as easily infer, *That only the Clergy ought to partake of this Ceremony*, because they were only those present to whom it was said *Do this*? But if this [*Do this*] be extended to all, how comes it that all have not liberty to obey it, in both blessing, breaking, and distributing, as well as taking and eating? Besides all these, even the Calvinian Protestants of Great Britain could never yet accord among themselves about the Manner of taking it, whether sitting, standing, or kneeling; whether it should be given to the Sick, and those that are ready to Die, or not: Which Controversies, tho' they may be esteemed of small moment, yet have greatly contributed, with other things.

Not Con-
tests about
the Man-
ner of Ta-
king it, and
to whom
to Give it.

things, to be the occasion not only of much Contention, but also of Blood-shed and Devastation; so that in this last respect the *Prelatick Calvinists* have termed the *Presbyterians* Schismatical and Pertinacious, and and they them again Superstitious, Idolatrous and Papistical. Who then that will open their Eyes, but may see that the Devil hath stirred up this Contention and Zeal, to busie men about things of small Moment, that greater Matters may be neglected, while he keeps them in such a-do about this Ceremony; while they lay aside others of the like Nature, as positively Commanded, and as punctually Practised, and from the Observation of which, half so many Difficulties will not follow?

§ VIII. How then? Have we not Reason, not finding the Nature of this Practice to be obligatory upon us, more than those other our Adversaries have laid aside, to avoid all this Confusion, since those that use it, can never agree, neither concerning the Nature, Efficacy, nor Manner of doing it? And this proceeds, because they take it not plainly, as it lies in the Scripture; but have

so much mixed in their own Inventions.

For would they take it as it lies, it would import no more, than that *Jesus Christ at that time did thereby signifie unto them, that his Body and Blood was to be offered for them; and desired them, that whensoever they did eat or drink, they might do it in Remembrance of him, or with a Regard to him, whose Blood was shed for them.*

Now that the *Primitive Church*, gathered immediately after his Ascension, did so understand it, doth appear from their Use and Practice, if we admit those places in the *Acts*, where *breaking of Bread* is spoken of, to have relation hereto; which as our Adversaries do, so we shall willingly agree to. As first, *Acts 2. 42. And they continued stedfastly in the Apostles Doctrine, and Fellowship, and in Breaking of Bread, &c.* This cannot be understood of any other than of their *Ordinary Eating*; for as nothing else appears from the *Text*, so the *Context* makes it plain; for they had all things in common; and therefore it is said, *Ver. 26. And they continuing daily with one accord in the Temple, and Breaking of Bread from House to House, did eat their*
Meat

By Break-
ing of
Bread they
had all
things in
common;
Remem-
bering the
Lord.

Meat with gladness, and singleness of heart. Who will not wilfully close their Eyes, may see here, that their *Breaking* being joyned with their *Eating*, shews, that nothing else is here expressed, but that, having all things in common, and so continuing together, they also did *Break their Bread*, and *Eat their Meat together*: In doing whereof I shall not doubt but they *Remembered the Lord*, to follow whom they had with so great *Zeal* and *Resignation* betaken themselves. This is further manifest from *Acts 6.26*. For the Apostles having the *Care* and *Distribution* of that *Money*, which the Believers having sold their Possessions gave unto them, finding themselves over-charged with that Burthen, appointed Deacons for that business, that they might give themselves continually to *Prayer*, and to the *Ministry* of the *Word*; not leaving that, to *serve Tables*. Deacons appointed for serving at Tables. This cannot be meant of any Sacramental Eating, or Religious Act of Worship; seeing our Adversaries make the *distributing* of that, the proper Act of *Ministers*, not of *Deacons*: And yet there can be no Reason alledged, that that *Breaking of Bread* which they are said to have *Continued in*, and to have done from *House to House*,

House, was other, than those *Tables* that the Apostles *served*, but here gave over, as finding themselves over-charged with it.

Now as the increase of the Disciples did incapacitate the Apostles any more to manage this ; so it would seem their further Increase and Dispersing in divers places, hindered the continuance of that Practice of having things in Common : But notwithstanding , so far at least to Remember or Continue that Antient Community, they did at certain times come together, and *break Bread* together.

At Troas
the Supper
till Mid-
night de-
ferred.

Hence it is said, *Acts* 20. 7. that *Paul* coming to *Troas*, *And upon the first day of the Week, when the Disciples came together to Break Bread, Paul preached unto them, ready to depart on the Morrow, and continued his Speech until Midnight* : Here is no mention made of any *Sacramental Eating*, but only, that *Paul* took occasion from their being together, to preach unto them. And it seems, it was a Supper they intended, (not a Morning-Bit of Bread and Sup of Wine) else its not very probable, that *Paul* would from the Morning have preached until Midnight. But the Eleventh Verse puts the mat-

ter out of Dispute, which is thus: *When he therefore was come up again, and had broken Bread, and eaten, and talked a long while, even till break of day, so he departed*: This shews, that the *Breaking of Bread* was deferred till that time; for those words [*and when he had broken Bread, and eaten*] do shew, that it had a relation to the *Breaking of Bread* aforementioned, and that that was the time he did it. Secondly; These words joined together, [*and when he had broken Bread, and eaten, and talked*] shew, it was no Religious Act of Worship, but only an *Eat-They or-ly did Eat for refresh- ing the Bo-*ing for bodily Refreshment, for which the Christians used to Meet together some time: And doing it in God's Fear and Singleness of Heart, doth notwithstanding difference it from the *Eating or Feasting of prophane Persons*. And this by some is called a *Love-Feast*, or a being together not merely to feed their Bellies, or for outward Ends; but to take thence occasion to Eat and Drink together in the Dread and Presence of the Lord, as his People: Which Custom we shall not Condemn; but let it be observed, that in all the Acts there is no other, nor further mention of this matter. But if that Ceremony had been some

The Christians began by degrees to depart from the Primitive Purity.

2 Cor. 11. 17. Concerning the Supper (of the Lord, so called) Explained.

Solemn Sacrifice, as some will have it, or such a *Special Sacrament*, as others plead it to be, it is strange, that that *History*, that in many lesser things gives a *particular Account* of the *Christians Behaviour*, should have been so silent in the matter: Only we find, that they used sometimes to *Meet together to break Bread and Eat*: Now as the *Primitive Christians* began by degrees to depart from that *Primitive Purity and Simplicity*, so as to accumulate *Superstitious Traditions*, and vitiate the *Innocent Practices* of their *Predecessors*, by the intermixing either of *Jewish* or *Heathenish Rites*; so also in the *Use* of this, very early *Abuses* began to creep in among Christians, so that it was needful for the *Apostle Paul* to *Reform* them, and *Reprove* them therefore, as he doth at large, 1 Cor. 11. from ver. 17. to the End: Which place we shall particularly Examine, because our *Adversaries* lay the *chief Stress* of their matter upon it; and we shall see, whether it will infer any more, than we have above granted. *First*, Because they were apt to use that *Practice* in a *superstitious* mind beyond the *true Use* of it, as to make of it some *Mystical Supper* of the *Lord*, he tells them, v. 20. That their
Coming

Coming together into one place, is not to Eat the Lord's Supper; he saith not, *This is not the right Manner to Eat*, but, *This is not to Eat the Lord's Supper*; because the Supper of the Lord is *Spiritual, and a Mystery*. Secondly, He blames them, in that they come together for the worse, and not for the better; the Reason he gives of this, is *ver. 21. For in Eating every one hath taken before his own Supper; and one is hungry, and another is drunken*: Here it is plain, that the Apostle Condemns them for that, because this Custom of Supping in general was used among Christians for to increase their Love, and as a Memorial of *Christ's Supping* with the Disciples, that they should have so vitiated it, to eat it apart; and to come full, who had abundance, and hungry, who had little at home; whereby the very Use and End of this Practice is lost and perverted: And therefore he blames them, that they do not either Eat this in Common at home, or reserve their Eating, till they come all together to the *Publick Assembly*. This appears plainly by the following *verse 22. Have ye not Houses to eat and to drink in? Or despise ye the Church of God, and shame them, that have not?* Where he blames

Why the Custom of Supping in Common was used among Christians?

them for their *Irregular Practice* herein, in that they despised to *Eat orderly*, or reserve their *Eating* to the *Publick Assembly*, and so shaming such as not having *Houses*, nor *Fulness* at home, came to partake of the *Common Table*; who, being *hungry*, thereby were ashamed, when they observed others come thither *full and drunken*. Those that without prejudice will look to the place, will see, this must have been the *Case* among the *Corinthians*: For supposing the *Use* of this to have been then, as now *used* either by *Papists*, *Lutherans* or *Calvinists*, it is hard making sense of the *Apostle's* words, or indeed to conceive, what was the *Abuse* the *Corinthians* committed in this thing. Having thus observed, what the *Apostle* said above, because this *Custom of Eating and Drinking together some time*, had its rise from *Christ's Act with the Apostles the Night he was betrayed*; therefore the *Apostle* proceeds, *ver. 23.* to give them an *Account* of that: *For I have received of the Lord, that which also I delivered unto you, that the Lord Jesus, the same Night, in which he was betrayed, took Bread, &c.* Those, that understand the difference betwixt a *Narration* of a thing, and a *Command*

The Rise
of that Cu-
stm.

mand, cannot but see, if they will, that there is no Command in this place, but only an *Account of Matter of Fact*: He saith not, *I received of the Lord, that as he took Bread, so I should command it to you to do so also*; there is nothing like this in the place: Yea, on the contrary, *ver. 25.* where he repeats *Christ's Imperative Words* to his Apostles, he placeth them so, as they import no Command; *This do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in Remembrance of me:* That (as often) imports no Command of this Supper. And then he adds; *For as often as ye eat this Bread, and drink this Cup, ye do shew the Lord's Death, till he come*: But these words [as often] imports no more a Command, than to say, *As often as thou goest to Rome, see the Capitol*; will infer a Command to me, to go thither.

But whereas they urge the last words, *Object.* *Ye shew forth the Lords Death, till he come,* insinuating, *That this imports a necessary Continuance of that Ceremony, until Christ come at the end of the World to Judgment.*

I Answer: They take Two of the Chief *Ans.* *Parts of the Controversie* here for granted, without proof. *First,* That [as often] imports a Command, the contrary whereof is

Christ's
Outward
and In-
ward Com-
ing.

To Re-
member
Christ's
Death till
he come.
To Arise
in the —
Heart.

is shewn ; neither will they ever be able to prove it. *Secondly*, That this *Coming* is understood of *Christ's last outward Coming*, and not of his *Inward and Spiritual*, that remains to be proved ; whereas the Apostle might well understand it of his *Inward Coming and Appearance*, which perhaps some of those *Carnal Corinthians*, that used to come *drunken* together, had not yet known : And others, being *Weak* among them, and inclinable to *dote* upon *Outwards*, this might have been *Indulged* to them for a season, and even used by those, who knew *Christ's Appearance in Spirit*, (as other things were, of which we shall speak hereafter) especially by the Apostle, who became *Weak* to the *Weak*, and *All* to *All*, that he might *save* some. Now those *Weak* and *Carnal Corinthians* might be permitted the *Use* of this, to *Shew forth* or *Remember Christ's Death*, till he *come* to *Arise* in them ; for though such need those outward things to put them in mind of *Christ's Death*, yet such, as are *dead* with *Christ*, and not only *dead* with *Christ*, but *buried*, and also *arisen* with him, need not such *Signs* to *Remember* him. And to such therefore the Apostle saith, *Col. 3. 1. If ye then*

then be risen with Christ, seek those things which are above, where Christ sitteth on the right hand of God: But Bread and Wine are not these things, that are above; but are things of the Earth. But that this whole matter was a meer Act of Indulgence and Condescendence of the Apostle Paul to the Weak and Carnal Corinthians, appears yet more by the Syriack Copy, which ver. 17. in his entring upon this matter, hath it thus: *In that, concerning which I am about to command you (or instruct you,) I commend you not, because ye have not gone forward, but are descended unto that, which is less, (or of less Consequence:)* Clearly importing, that the Apostle was grieved, that such was their Condition, that he was forc'd to give them Instructions concerning those Outward things; and doting upon which they shew, they were not gone forward in the Life of Christianity; but rather sticking in beggarly Elements. And therefore ver. 20. the same Version hath it thus; *When then ye meet together, ye do not do it, as it is just ye should do in the day of the Lord, ye eat and drink: Thereby shewing to them, that To Meet together to eat and drink Outward Bread*
and

And likewise the other Oriental Versions, as the Arabick and Aethiopic, have it the same way.

and Wine, was not the *Labour and Work of that Day of the Lord*. But since our *Adversaries* are so zealous for this Ceremony, because used by the Church of Corinth, (though with how little ground, is already shewn) how come they to pass over far more positive *Commands* of the Apostles, as matters of no moment? As First, *Acts* 15. 26. where the Apostles peremptorily *Command* even the Gentiles, as that, which was the Mind of the Holy Ghost, *To abstain from things strangled, and from Blood?* And *Jam.* 5. 14. where it is expressly Commanded, *That the Sick be Anointed with Oil in the Name of the Lord.*

To abstain
from
things
strangled.

The A-
nointing
with Oil.

Object. If they say, *These were only Temporary things, but not to Continue.*

Ans. What have they more to shew for this, there being no express *Repeal* of them?

Object. If they say; *The Repeal is implied, because the Apostle saith, We ought not to be judged in Meats and Drinks.*

Ans. I admit the Answer; but how can it be

be evited to militate the same way against the *other Practice*? Surely not at all: nor can there be any thing urged for the *one*, more than for the *other*, but *Custom* and *Tradition*.

And for that of *James*, they say, Object. *There followed a Miracle upon it, to wit, the Recovery of the Sick; But, this being Ceased, so should the Ceremony.*

Though this might many ways be answered, to wit; That *Prayer* then might as well be *forborn*, to which also the *saving* of the *Sick* is there ascribed: Yet I shall accept of it, because I judge indeed, that *Ceremony* is *Ceased*; A Ceremony ought to Cease, its Vertue failing. only me thinks, since our *Adversaries* ought to Cease, its Vertue failing. (and that rightly) think, a *Ceremony* ought to *Cease*, where the *Vertue* fails; they ought by the same Rule, to forbear the *laying on of Hands*, in *Imitation of the Apostles*, since the *Gift of the Holy Ghost* doth not follow upon it. Thus Laying on of hands.

§ IX. But since we find, that several *Testimonies* of *Scripture* do sufficiently shew, that *Such External Rites* are *no necessary part of the New Covenant-Dispensation*

The Ceremony of Bread and Wine is Ceas'd.

sation, therefore not needful now to Continue, however they were for a season practised of old; I shall instance some few of them, whereby from the Nature of the thing, as well as those *Testimonies*, it may appear, that the Ceremony of Bread and Wine is Ceased, as well as those other things, confessed by our *Adversaries* to be so. The first is *Rom. 14. 17.* For the Kingdom of God is not Meat and Drink, but Righteousness and Peace, and Joy in the Holy Ghost: Here the Apostle evidently shews, that the Kingdom of God, or Gospel of Christ, stands not in Meats and Drinks, and such like things, but in Righteousness; as by the Context doth appear, where he is speaking of the Guilt and Hazzard of judging one another about Meats and Drinks. So then, if the Kingdom of God stand not in them, nor the Gospel, nor Work of Christ, then the Eating of Outward Bread and Wine can be no necessary part of the Gospel-Worship, nor any perpetual Ordinance of it. Another is yet more plain of the same Apostle, *Col. 2. 16.* The Apostle throughout this whole Second Chapter doth clearly plead for us, and against the Formality and Superstition of our Opposers: For in the beginning he holds

Col. 2.

holds forth the great *Priviledges* Christians have by Christ, who are come indeed to the *Life of Christianity*; and therefore he desires them, *ver. 6. As they have received Christ, so to walk in him, and to be ware, lest they be spoiled through Philosophy and vain Deceit, after the Rudiments or Elements of the World, because that in Christ, whom they have received, is all Fulness: And that they are Circumcised with the Circumcision made without Hands (which he calls the Circumcision of Christ) and being buried with him by Baptism, are also arisen with him through the Faith of the Operation of God.* Here also they did partake of the *True Baptism of Christ*; and being such, as are *Arisen* with him, let us see, whether he thinks it needful, they should make use of such *Meat and Drink*, as *Bread and Wine*, to put them in Remembrance of *Christ's Death*? Or whether they ought to be judged, that they did it not, *ver. 16. Let no Man therefore judge you in Meat or Drink? Is not Bread and Wine, Meat and Drink? But why? Which are a Shadow of things to come: But the Body is of Christ.* Then since our *Adversaries* Confess, that their *Bread and Wine* is a *Sign* or *Shadow*, therefore, according to the *A-*

*'Tis but a
Sign and
Shadow,
they con-
fess.*

postle's

postle's Doctrine, we ought not to be
Judged in the *Observation* of it. But is it
 not fit for those, that are *Dead with Christ*;
 to be subject to such *Ordinances*? See what
 he saith, *ver. 20. Wherefore, if ye be dead*
with Christ from the Rudiments of the World,
why, as though living in the World, are ye
subject to Ordinances? (Touch not, taste
not, handle not: Which all are to perish with
the Using) after the Commandments and
Doctrines of Men: What can be more
 plain? If this serve not to take away
 the *Absolute Necessity* of the use of *Bread*
 and *Wine*, what can it serve to take a-
 way? Sure I am, the Reason here given
 is applicable to them, *which all do perish*
with the using; since *Bread and Wine peri-*
sheth with the using, as much as other
 things. But further, if the use of *Water*,
 and *Bread and Wine* were that, wherein
 the very *Seals* of the *New Covenant* stood,
 and did pertain to the *Chief Sacraments* of
 the *Gospel* and *Evangelical Ordinances*, (so
 called) then would not the *Gospel* differ
 from the *Law*, or be preferable to it?
 Whereas the Apostle shews the difference,
Heb. 9. 10. in that such kind of *Observa-*
tions of the Jews were as a *Sign* of the
Gospel, for that this stood only in *Meats*
 and

And
 which do
 perish with
 the Using.

The Law
 was Meats
 and Drinks
 not so the
 Gospel.

and Drinks, and divers Washings. And now, if the Gospel-Worship and Service stand in the same, where is the difference?

If it be said, *Those under the Gospel Object, have a Spiritual Signification.*

So had those under the Law, God was *Ans.* the Author of those, as well as Christ is pretended to be the Author of these. But doth not this contending for the use of Water, Bread and Wine, as necessary Parts of the Gospel-Worship, destroy the Nature of it, as if the Gospel were a Dispensation of Shadows, and not of the Substance; whereas the Apostle in that of the Colossians above-mentioned argues against the Use of these things, as needful to those, that are dead and arisen with Christ, because they are but Shadows? And since through the whole Epistle to the Hebrews, he argues with the Jews to Wean them from their Worship, for this Reason, because it was Typical and Figurative; is it agreeable to right Reason to bring them to another of the same Nature? What ground from Scripture or Reason can our Adversaries bring us to,
I evince,

The Law has Shadow the Gospel brings the Substance.

Concerning the Body

vince, that one *Shadow* or *Figure* should point to another *Shadow* or *Figure*, and not to the *Substance*? And yet they make the *Figure* of *Circumcision* to point to *Water-Baptism*, and the *Paschal Lamb* to *Bread* and *Wine*. But was it ever known, that one *Figure* was the *Antitype* of the other, especially, seeing *Protestants* make not these their *Antitypes* to have any more *Vertue* or *Efficacy*, than the *Type* had? For since, as they say, and that truly, *That their Sacraments confer not Grace, but that is conferred according to the Faith of the Receiver*; it will not be denied, but the *Faithful* among the *Jews* received also *Grace* in the Use of their *Figurative Worship*. And though *Papists* boast, that their *Sacraments* confer *Grace ex opere operato*, yet *Experience* abundantly proveth the contrary.

Their Sacraments confer not Grace.

Opposers claim a Power to give their Sacraments from whence do they derive it

§ X. But supposing the Use of *Water-Baptism*, and *Bread* and *Wine*, to have been in the *Primitive Church*, as was also that of *Abstaining from things strangled, and from Blood*; the use of *Legal Purifications*, *Acts* 21. 23, 24, 25. and *Anointing of the Sick with Oil*, for the Reasons and Grounds

Grounds before - mentioned : Yet it remains for our Adversaries to shew us how they come by Power or Authority to Administer them ? It cannot be from the Letter of the Scripture, else they behoved also to do those other things, which the Letter declares also they did, and which in the Letter have as much Foundation. Then their power must be derived from the Apostles either Mediate-ly, or Immediately; but we have shewn before, in the Tenth Proposition, that they have no Mediate Power, because of the Interruption made by the Apostacy : And for an Immediate Power or Command by the Spirit of God, to Administer these things, none of our Adversaries pretend to it.

We know, that in this, as in other things, they make a Noise of the *Constant Consent of the Church*, and of *Christianity in all Ages* : But as *Tradition* is not a sufficient Ground for *Faith*, so in this matter especially it ought to have but *small* Tradition
no sufficient
ground
for Faith. *Weight*, for that in this Point of Ceremonies and Superstitious Observations, the Apostacy began very early; as may appear in the Epistles of *Paul* to the

Galatians and *Colossians* : And we have no ground to imitate them in those things, whose Entrance the Apostle so much withstood, so heavily regretted, and so sharply reprov'd.

But if we look to *Antiquity*, we find that in such kind of Observances and Traditions, they were very uncertain and changeable ; so that neither *Protestants* nor *Papists* do observe this Ceremony, as They did, both in that they gave it to Young Boys and to Little Children : And for ought can be learned, the Use of this and Infant-Baptism are of a like Age ; though the one be laid aside both by *Papists* and *Protestants*, and the other, to wit, Baptism of Infants, be stuck to.

The Supper they gave to Young Boys and Little Children.

And we have so much the less Reason to lay Weight upon *Antiquity*, for that, if we consider their Profession of Religion, especially as to Worship, and the Ceremonial Part of it, we shall not find any Church now, whether *Popish* or *Protestant*, who differ not widely from them in many things ; as *Daleus* in his Treatise concerning the use of the Fathers,

Daleus.

Daleus.

thers, well Observeth and Demonstra-
teth.

And why they should Obtrude this upon us, because of the *Ancient's Practice*, which they themselves follow not; or why we may not *Reject This*, as well as they do *Other Things*, no less Zealously practised by the *Ancients*, there is no sufficient Reason can be assigned.

I shall not nevertheless doubt, but that many, whose Understandings have been *Clouded* with these *Ceremonies*, have notwithstanding by the Mercy of God, had some Secret Sense of the Mystery, which they could not Clearly Understand, because it was Vailed from them, by their sticking unto such Outward Things: And that through that Secret Sense Diving in their Comprehensions, they ran themselves into these Carnal Apprehensions, as imagining, the Substance of the Bread was Changed; or if the Substance was not changed, yet the *Body* was there, &c.

And indeed, I am inclinable very fa-
vourably

Calvin's
ingenuous
Confession
commended

vourably to judge of *Calvin* in this particular, in that he deals so ingenuously to confess, he *neither Comprehends, nor can express it in Words*; but yet by a feeling Experience can say, *The Lord is spiritually present.*

Now as I do not doubt, but *Calvin* sometimes had a *Sense* of this *Presence* without the Use of this Ceremony, so as the Understanding given him of God, made him justly reject the false Notions of *Transubstantiation* and *Consubstantiation*, though he knew not *what to Establish* instead of them: If he had fully waited in that *Light* that makes *all Things* Manifest, and had not laboured in his own Comprehension, to settle upon that External Ceremony, by affixing the Spiritual Presence as Chiefly or Principally, though not only (as he well knew by Experience) there, or especially to relate to it; he might have reached further unto the *Knowledge* of this Mystery, than many that went before him.

In tender-
ness of
Conscience
at Ignorance
God
winketh.

§ XI. Lastly, If any now at this Day, from a true *Tenderness* of *Spirit*, and with real *Conscience* towards God, did practise this Ceremony in the same Way,
Me-

Method and Manner, as did the Primitive Christians recorded in Scripture; (which yet none, that I know, now do) I should not doubt to affirm, but they might be indulged in it; and the Lord might regard them, and for a season *Appear* to them in the Use of these things; as many of us have known him to do to us, in the time of our Ignorance: Provided always, they did not seek to *Obtrude* them upon others, nor Judge such as found themselves *Delivered*, or that they do not pertinaciously adhere to them.

For we certainly know that the Day The Day is Dawn'd that God is Risen, and worshipped in Spirit. is *Dawned*, in which God hath *Arisen*, and hath *Dismissed* all those *Ceremonies* and *Rites*, and is only to be *Worshipped* in *Spirit*; and that he *Appears* to them who *Wait* upon him: And that to *Seek* God *in these things* is, with *Mary* at the *Sepulcher*, To *seek the Living among the Dead*: For we know that he is *Arisen*, and *Revealed* in *Spirit*, leading his *Children* out of these *Rudiments*; that they may *Walk* with Him in his *Light*: To whom be *Glory* for ever! *Amen.*

T H E E N D.

BOOKS Printed and Sold by T. Sowle, next to
the Meeting-House in White-Hart-Court in
Gracious-Street.

THe Works of that Memorable and Ancient
Servant of Christ, *Stephen Crisp*; contain-
ing also a Journal of his Life, giving an Account
of his Convincement, Travels, Labours, and
Sufferings in and for the Truth. Price bound 5s.

A Collection of the several Writings and
Faithful Testimonies of that Suffering Servant
of God, and patient Follower of the Lamb,
Humphry Smith. Price bound 2 s. 6 d.

A Collection of certain Epistles and Testi-
monies of Divine Consolation, Experience and
Doctrine; Written by that Faithful; Patient,
and Long-suffering Servant of Christ, *William
Bennis*. Price bound 1 s. 8 d.

The Memory of the Righteous Revived, be-
ing a brief Collection of the Books and writ-
ten Epistles of *John Camm* and *John Audland*:
Together with several Testimonies relating to
those two Faithful Labourers. Price bound 2 s.

Truth Vindicated, by the Faithful Testimo-
ny and Writings of the Innocent Servant and
Handmaid of the Lord *Elizabeth Bathurst*, De-
ceased. Price bound 1 s.

A Catechism and Confession of Faith. By
R. Barclay, Price bound 9 d.

No Cross, No Crown. A Discourse shew-
ing the *Nature* and *Discipline* of the Holy Cross
of Christ. By *W. Penn*, In two Parts; Price 3 s.

An Account of *W. Penn's* Travails in *Holland*
and *Germany*, Anno MDCLXXVII. Price 2 s.

A Brief Account of the *Rise* and *Progress* of
the People called *Quakers*. By *W. Penn*. Price 1 s.

ro
n

at
-
at
d
s.
d
at
o,

i.
d
r,
m

-
-
l:
o

o-
d
e-

y

-
fs
s:
d

s.
of
s.

